

STUDIES
IN THE
LATIN OF THE MIDDLE AGES
AND THE
RENAISSANCE

BY
VICTOR SELDEN CLARK
Fellow in Latin, Columbia University

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF
PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

STUDIES
IN THE
LATIN OF THE MIDDLE AGES
AND THE
RENAISSANCE

BY
VICTOR SELDEN CLARK

Fellow in Latin, Columbia University



SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF
PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY
LANCASTER, PA.

COPYRIGHT, 1900
By VICTOR SELDEN CLARK

CONTENTS.

PART ONE.—THE LATIN OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

Classical Latin and the Sermo Plebeius	1
The Vulgate and the History of the Franks	3
The Last of Spoken Latin among the Commons	13
The Carolingian Revival	17
The Waltharius and the Troilus	23
The Latin of the Chroniclers	33
The Latin of the Schoolmen	35
The Goliard Songs and the Gesta Romanorum	40
The Survival of Ancient Culture in Italy	49

PART TWO.—LATIN OF THE RENAISSANCE.

The Latin of Dante	61
Petrarch and the Beginning of New Latin	66
Erasmus and Quasi-Vernacular Latin	82



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41555028_0002

PART ONE.

THE LATIN OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

I.

It is an interesting as well as a significant fact that Latin, the language that has played the most important part of any perhaps in the history of the civilized world, has during almost its whole literary existence been the language of a class, holding itself aloof from the household tongue of the common people even when most intimately related to it. At the very time of its greatest degradation it was to a certain extent aristocratic in its character, its traditions, and its sympathies. This fact is significant; for upon it probably depended the very possibility of Latin's continuing a world language. No form of speech could long withstand the discrete, disintegrating tendencies of the commons, though it might continue to serve for a long period as the universal tongue of the narrower sympathied, but, from the point of view of nationality, more liberally educated classes. It is no ordinary phenomenon that this language, so foreign in its very essence to modern life, should still remain the touchstone of culture through all the enlightened world. If we can throw though it be but a partial and transient light upon some of the features of its genesis and history that help to explain this fact, the object of the present writer will have been attained.

The literary language of Rome at the time of Cicero and Augustus was a cultivated variety of the Roman dialect of Latin. It represented the result of a process of differentiation that had been going on for over two centuries, separating the originally homogeneous speech into a cultivated and a vulgar dialect,* a process that had been hastened and emphasized by the introduction of Greek culture at Rome, and by the political importance which the conquests of Rome's generals had given to her language in the legal and administrative world.

As such, the literary idiom of Rome must be distinguished from the dialect of the Roman commons on the one hand, and from the rustic dialects—of the same Italic stock, but more remotely related to it—on the other. This fact, that literary Latin stood in a different relation to the language of the people at large than our own cultivated English does to the colloquial English of the streets, must be kept in mind not only in considering the development of Latin during the period when it was, in the conventional sense of the word, a living language understood by the whole people, but also in judging its position during the Middle Ages, its relation to the Revival of Learning, and its literary predominance at the time of the

*The best statement of this view is found in Fauriel, *o. c.* II, page 443. Compare also Schuchardt, *o. c.* I, pp. 44 et seq.; and Rönsch, *o. c.* page 12. Gröber, *Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter*, A. L. L. vol. I, pp. 204 et seq., contains some interesting suggestions as to the relation of the vulgar Latin to the provincial dialects. The German authorities should be read, however, in the light of an interesting note by Bonnet, *o. c.* page 31, note. The most recent extensive work upon the non-literary Latin, though confined to a particular field, is Cooper's *Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*, Boston, 1896.

Renaissance. We are not at the present time conscious of any fundamental, deep-lying transformation going on in our own language. It is extending its vocabulary, assimilating new words and excreting exhausted ones right along, as part of the vital process attending its growth; but its grammar is essentially the same that it was at the time of Chaucer, and it requires no artificial, no external influence to keep it so. On the other hand, the testimony of its own writers apart, the very existence of the Romance languages attests the fact that there was going on in the very heart and core of the Latin language a change that was hinted at rather than recorded in its written literature. The analytic tendency is already visible in the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*, at the opening of the second century before the Christian era. How wide and how rapid the divergence that took place between written and spoken Latin during the classical period may always remain largely a matter for conjecture; but that there was such a divergence is certain. The change in the popular speech was comprehensive. Had it been one of vocalization and vocabulary alone, the Romance languages would have been as synthetic as modern Greek, or possibly more so. Had the change been purely grammatical, we should have had a modern Latin in universal use similar in some of its features perhaps to the popular Latin of the *Gesta Romanorum*.

Classical Latin, then, was in one sense artificial. It retained its elevation against the force of gravity; it was built to express scholarly thoughts; it was adapted in its very genesis to become the language of learning and official correspondence. And though this fact of its internal history may play a subordinate part, we must take it into account when we attempt to explain the persistence of Latin through the Dark Ages, and its revival in classical form contemporaneously with the maturing of the vulgar tongues of Europe. For, after all, this revival, dependent as it was upon all the past history of Latin, was a curious, an entirely unprecedented phenomenon. That two such indigenous things as Gothic architecture and Romance literature should have succumbed, the one entirely and the other partially, to classical influences, is an altogether different thing from the melting away of Italian native art and literature before the glory of Greek genius. And though in literature the Romance inspiration ultimately reasserted itself, it was only after being profoundly modified by its long tutelage to the elder Muses. It was those who strove to adapt Latin to Greek literary ideals and to the demands made upon it by Rome's suddenly widened intercourse with other nations, that, by the very fixity and formal correctness which they imparted to that language, laid the foundations for the long supremacy which it never would have possessed had it remained in sympathetic touch with the rapid evolution of the spoken speech. And to just the extent that it was influenced by that evolution did it become perverted and incapable of performing the function for which it was designed.

The popular speech of the Romans was becoming Italian by the time that Rome had conquered Italy. Still there was an intense, peasant-like conservatism about the Roman commons that led them to retain long and tenaciously certain archaic features of their early language. It is probable, however, that the large influx of foreigners during the late Republic and early Empire had a cosmopolitan influence upon the urban dialect. The vicissitudes attending Rome's subsequent political misfortunes were reflected in the cultivated and the popular language alike, with this exception, that the latter preserved its vitality upon the tongues of

the people, while the former tended to become a sort of official *lingua franca* with the monks and notaries, and even with the learned was modified by the influence of the colloquial dialects and new forms of thought, until it lost nearly every vestige of its former elegance and grace, and became the barbarous Latin which, after serving as a vehicle for the thought of Western Europe for seven centuries, both by its negative and its positive influence, contributed to the later revival of that tongue in its classic purity that was so important a feature of the Renaissance.

At the time of the Revival of Learning, however, Latin could not be purged at once of all that it had acquired and more or less thoroughly assimilated during the thousand years of its literary eclipse. It therefore becomes important for us to get at least a general idea of this so-called barbarous Latin, not only because of its intrinsic value in linguistic history, but also in order that we may better understand the details of character that distinguish the Latin of the Renaissance from the Latin of Cicero and his contemporaries and immediate successors.

II.

The causes that occasioned the degradation of Latin in the Middle Ages were manifold, and we cannot hope to trace their influence in detail. That language had reached its highest development in an urban centre of extreme culture, under the influence of literary patronage, in an atmosphere of pagan artistic and literary ideals and philosophic thought. It was natural that when these conditions were changed, and in most instances completely reversed, the result should be a profound modification of the language which they had produced. Not only were rhetorical elegance and literary forms affected, but grammar and vocabulary as well. In a very general way we may attempt to classify the causes that gave to mediæval Latin its ultimate form, but we cannot assume that this classification is absolutely exhaustive, nor that its divisions are in every instance mutually exclusive.

I. Christian Influence : This is seen

- (a) In the introduction of new abstract terms, Greek words, and Greek grammatical forms, by the Church Fathers and translators ;
- (b) In the antagonistic attitude toward pagan literature, and consequently toward pagan literary forms and ideals ;
- (c) In the favor shown to plebeian words, idioms, and literary forms.

II. Political Influence : This resulted

- (a) In the introduction of a large number of technical terms designating political and social—including ecclesiastical—institutions ;
- (b) In the introduction of proper names of persons and places foreign to classical literature.

III. Ignorance and Intellectual Apathy : This resulted of course from the political and social conditions, and we see its influence

- (a) In inaccurate orthography and arbitrary grammatical irregularities ;
- (b) In the disappearance of classical Latin as a spoken language over large areas and among a large part of the population ;
- (c) In credulity, poverty of thought and literary inspiration, and the general intellectual barrenness and lack of originality that characterized the Dark Ages.

These are some of the causes, that make the history of Latin different from that of its sister language Greek, for instance, or from what we may reasonably anticipate will be the history of English or any other of the more important modern tongues. Had the Latin speaking races retained their political integrity and their moral and intellectual stamina, their language might have undergone a gradual process of transformation; it probably would have become more analytic, analogous possibly to modern German; rhyme and accentual rhythm would doubtless have taken the place of quantity metre in verse; new words would have been coined to meet the new demands made upon the language by industrial development and the evolution of thought and institutions. But the continuity of the literary language would not have been lost. We should have had an Old Latin, a Middle Latin, and a New Latin perhaps, but not a classical Latin, a barbarous Latin, and a Renaissance Latin. The spoken and the written language would have developed hand in hand.

It is true that the terms Middle and New Latin are being used to-day, and that those scholars who are most familiar with the history of the Latin language as a whole are most ready to concede the organic unity of the three phases that this implies in its development, and to see under what at first blush appears arbitrary and artificial the working of the same linguistic laws that obtain in the popular speech. We cannot speak of Latin as a dead language, connoting what we generally do by the adjective, until after the time of Luther. But if it continued to live it was as an exotic plant; it was a product of the hot-house so to speak, and subject to all the abnormal sporting and variation that such a condition invariably produces.

Christian influences began, with the earliest converts, among the lowest classes of Roman society, and worked for a long time in a latent and unapparent way within the vulgar dialect before they finally broke through into the superimposed stratum of the literary speech. When they did manifest themselves in writing, therefore, they did so with a definiteness and assurance and vigor that betokened their previous discipline and humble origin. They came fresh from contact with the mother earth, and worked with Antæan energy upon the language. Their result during the Roman period is represented in two distinct though closely associated bodies of literature, the exegetical and polemical writings of the Church Fathers on the one hand, and the translations that later formed the basis for the Vulgate upon the other.

Considered as a whole, the patristic literature, though it differs widely from that of the pagan writers, does not even mark a phase of the transition to Mediæval Latin. It is true that even the earliest of the Christian writers, like Tertullian, ventured to create a new style, and to draw heavily upon the colloquial speech for new and vigorous forms of expression.* Plautus doubtless did the same. The introduction of fresh blood from the veins of the people was not going to hurt Latin, but rather to insure its preservation and continued growth. The Church Fathers, like the great jurists, adapted the language, without any considerable detriment to itself, to the new thoughts that it was called upon to express. It is because we see the language in the light of subsequent events, for which Christian literature was not itself responsible, that any change from the Augustan standard

* Hauschild, o. c., page 30, gives the number of new words in Tertullian's writings as 470.

seems an evidence of deterioration. The Christian writers, indeed, were not inspired by the purely artistic impulse that had dominated the literature of the classical period. Their works were not addressed to so homogeneous and compact a people. They and their writings were the product of their age. But from a purely linguistic point of view their influence went to maintain the integrity and power of the language. Their action upon it was conservative.

In the Vulgate, however, we find evidence of plebeian influences of a different kind. The popular speech is the field for linguistic experiments, and like all such fields its list of failures is usually much longer than its list of successes. The Church Fathers were, as a rule, men of more than mediocre literary training, and they selected and employed new turns and phrases with discriminating judgment. On the other hand the earliest translations of the Bible doubtless date from the time when Christian doctrine was confined, so far as the West was concerned, to the ignorant classes of the Italian and African cities. These versions, often of single books, were frequently temporary makeshifts, unauthorized and by no means uniform,* the work of individual translators acting independently with some transient perhaps and immediate object in view,† of men who were probably foreigners at Rome and knew Greek and Latin as the Jewish clothing clerks of the Bowery and Lower Broadway, for instance, know German and English. These men wrote the language that they spoke, with all its imperfections and irregularities. The hybrid character of their vocabulary and phraseology indicate that lack of fine linguistic discrimination which characterizes a polyglot commercial class.‡ The solecisms and plebeian colloquialisms thus incorporated in the Vulgate soon came to partake in the minds of the people of the sacredness of the book itself, and custom reconciled the ears of even the more highly educated to vulgar phrases and ungrammatical forms.§ Even Jerome, in the revision which gradually superseded all other versions in the course of the Middle Ages, did not try to use good grammar where it intruded upon familiar forms and received phraseology.|| In Africa a bishop was mobbed by his parishioners because he allowed the sacred text to be tampered with in the interest of literary purity. Thus canonized in their scripture, the speech of the Roman populace not only exercised a most important influence of the subsequent literature of the Middle Ages, but it so far

* Tertullian himself cites Bible passages two to three different ways, Hauschild, o. c., page 11.

† Augustine, de Doct. Christ., 2, 11; P. L., XXXIV, 34: *Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videtur, ausus est interpretari. Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas.*

‡ Tertullian, ad Marc., 2, 9; P. L., II, 321, A: *Quidam enim de Graece interpretantes, non recognita differentia nec curata proprietate verborum.*

§ Augustine, de Doct. Christ., II, 14; P. L., XXXIV, 45: *Tanta est vis consuetudinis etiam ad discendum, ut qui in scripturis sanctis quodam modo nutriti sunt magis alias locutiones mirentur easque minus Latinas putent, quam illas quas in scripturis didicerunt neque in Latinae linguae auctoribus reperiuntur.* And in the preceding chapter, *Illud enim quod iam auferre non possumus de ore cantantium populorum, super ipsum autem floriet sanctificatio mea, nihil profecto sententiae detrahit; auditor tamen peritior mallet hoc corrigi, ut non 'floriet' sed 'florebit' dicatur, nec quicquam impedit correctionem nisi consuetudo cantantium.*

|| Hieronymus, Com. in Ezech., 40, 5: *Illud autem semel monuisse sufficiat, nosse em cubitum et cubita neutriai appellari genere, sed pro simplicitate et facilitate intelligentiae vulgique consuetudine ponere et genere masculino. Non enim cura nobis est vitare sermonum vitia, sed scripturae sanctae obscuritatem quibuscumque verbis disserere.*

determined the form of translation into modern tongues as to leave its traces in the language and writings of the present day.

Without pretending to be exhaustive the following list indicates some of the principal features of the sermo plebeius which the Vulgate transmitted to the language and literature of the succeeding period :

I. VOCABULARY.

(1) Abstracts and words with typical endings : *adiuramentum*, Tob., 9, 5 ; *generamen*, Math., 23, 33 ; *sanctificium*, Ps., 77, 69 ; *exoratorium*, Ezech., 44, 27 ; *deambulacrum*, I Kings, 7, 2 ; *ornatura*, I Tim., 2, 9 ; *promptale*, Luke, 12, 3 ; *inundantia*, Luke, 6, 48 ; *circuitas*, Ezech., 48, 30 ; *adnuntiator*, Acts, 17, 19 ; *apostatrix*, Ezech., 2, 3 ; *frendor*, Math., 8, 12 ; *pigredo*, Prov., 19, 15 ; *ablactatio*, Gen., 21, 8 ; *aeditua*, Acts, 19, 35 ; *coruscus*, Luke, 17, 24. There are some new diminutives, *agniculus*, John, 2, 15 ; *tortula*, Num., 11, 8 ; *dextraliolum*, Judith, 10, 3. Substantives are formed from adjectives and participles, *infernis*, Gen., 37, 35 ; *discens*, John, 6, 66.

(2) New adjectives with conventional endings, *desperabilis*, Jerem., 15, 18 ; *perflatus*, Jerem., 22, 14 ; *magnalis*, Luke, 9, 44 ; *commixticius*, Ezech., 27, 17 ; *inebriosus*, Prov., 26, 9 ; *molinus*, Luke, 17, 2 ; *cooperarius*, I Cor., 3, 9 ; *fumbundus*, Gen., 15, 17 ; *bicameratus*, Gen., 6, 16. New adverbs also occur : *compatice*, Amos, 6, 1 ; *præfestinanter*, Esther, 6, 14.

(3) Many new verbs, most of the first conjugation. Some are derived from nouns, *custodiare*, Luke, 8, 20 ; *exemplare*, Col., 2, 15 ; others from adjectives, *iniquitare*, Acts, 7, 26 ; *deteriorare*, Ps., 37, 6 ; *proximare*, Math., 26, 46 ; several are of Greek origin, *hymnizare*, Mark, 14, 26 ; *scandalizare*, Math., 15, 12 ; *evangelizare*, Math., 11, 5 ; and there are others from various sources, *altificare*, John, 12, 34 ; *lucificare*, John, 1, 9 ; *ablactare*, Gen., 21, 8 ; *abrenuntiare*, Luke, 9, 61.

(4) Such new compounds as the following appear, *admanumdeductor*, Acts, 13, 11 ; *dictoaudientia*, I Sam., 15, 22 ; *benestabilis*, I Cor., 7, 35 ; *concorporalis*, Eph., 3, 6 ; *quincupliciter*, Gen., 43, 34. Parallel to these compounds and responding to the same demand that created them, are a large number of words borrowed directly from the Greek.

(5) Combinations of two prepositions or a preposition and an adverb occur occasionally that suggest a coming Romance word, *de foris* (dehors), Math., 23, 25 and 26 ; *de retro* (derrière), Luke, 8, 44 ; *de sursum* (dessus), Job, 18, 16 ; *ab ante* (avant), Luke, 19, 4 ; *de sub* (dessous), Exod., 17, 14.

(3) Many words are used with modified meanings. *Animositas* (wrath), Hebr., 11, 27 (*cortina* curtain), Exod., 26, 1 ; *mansio* (dwelling), John, 14, 2, have given corresponding words in English.

II. ORTHOGRAPHY.

While peculiarities of orthography in the manuscripts of the Vulgate rest upon too uncertain authority, in most instances, to prove much more than lack of uniformity, there are forms which are corroborated from other sources—the Lombard laws, for instance—and are interesting from the light they throw upon the relation on ancient pronunciation to modern Romance words. Such are the following :

iscientia for *scientia*, II Cor., 6, 6; *isperare* for *sperare*, Hebr., 11, 1; *istare* for *stare*, Ps., 133, 1; *spandere* for *expandere*, Deut., 32, 11; *speriri* for *experiri* Hebr., 11, 29; *grossus* for *crassus*, I Kings, 12, 10; *lanterna* for *lucerna*, John, 18, 3.

III. FLEXION AND SYNTAX.

(1) Irregularities of declension occur—*illum* for *illud*, Math., 13, 20; *uno* is a dative, Num., 19, 14; *lignum humilem*, Exod., 17, 24, and *vidua paupera*, Luke, 21, 3, are representative errors in case of adjectives, as are also *proximior*, Hebr., 6, 9, and *minimissimus*, II Kings, 18, 4. There is a like tendency to confuse conjugations: *exiet*, Math., 2, 6; *rediet*, Lev., 15, 10; *floriet*, Ps., 81, 15; *scibo*, Ps. 68, 125.

(2) Prepositions do not follow classical usage—*apud* for *ad*, *abierunt apud* *se*, John, 20, 10; *de* is instrumental, *extergere de linteo*, John, 13, 5; *in* is used indifferently with the accusative and ablative, *in veritatem stetit*, John, 8, 44; *fugiant in montibus*, Luke, 12, 21; and we find such phrases as *sine eum*, John, 1, 3; *de hanc*, John, 12, 27.

(3) Cases were also confused after verbs,—*obaudiant eum*, Math., 7, 27; *benedixit eum*, Gen., 28, 1; *non te nocebunt*, Num., 5, 19; *suade Hebraeam istam*, Jud., 12, 10.

(4) The finite verb takes the place of the infinitive in principal clauses indirect discourse, *vidit Deus quod esset bonum*, Gen., 1, 12; *scio quia bonus es tu*, I Kings, 19, 9; *cognovit David quoniam confirmasset eum Dominus regem super Israel*, II Kings, 5, 12. On the other hand, the infinitive is used regularly to express purpose, *venimus adorare eum*, Math., 2, 2; *quis demonstrabit vobis fugere a ventura ira?* Math., 3, 7.

(5) There is a tendency to make all subordinate sentences subjunctive, with the exception of those expressing condition, where we often find a simple inversion or an imperative used, *Mel invenisti, comede quod sufficit tibi*, Prov., 25, 16; *Aperi oculos tuos et saturare panibus*, Prov., 20, 13.

We have considered the Vulgate more at length because it probably exercised a greater influence than any other single book upon the Latin of the Middle Ages. It was used in a form that was from a literary point of view about equally corrupt in every part of western Europe, by all classes not entirely illiterate, during the whole period from the downfall of the Western Empire to the Revival of Learning. Its religious importance gave it in a certain sense literary infallibility in the opinion of its readers. Its variations from the classical form were in sympathy with the trend of evolution in the spoken language. The relation of the Romance languages to Latin, and the processes by which they were evolved from it, are not germane to our subject; but it is certain that the strong undercurrent of living colloquial speech was flowing in the direction indicated by the language of the Vulgate and tended to reinforce the influence of the latter upon the literary idiom.

We must remember also that the very spirit of the age was antagonistic to classical culture by the time that the Christian faith had been embraced by the barbarians. Gregory the Great, the Pope who first sent missionaries to Saxon England, was one of those who espoused most ardently the cause of literary barbarism, if we may use the expression. He does not avoid crude rhetoric, bar-

barous expressions, inaccurate syntax,* for he considers it unworthy of their divine dignity that the messages of heaven should be subject to the rules of Donatus. The Church councils issued decree after decree against the book of the Gentiles,† and Gregory forbade the teaching of the profane literature in cathedral schools because the praises of Jove should not be heard from the same mouth as the praises of Christ.‡ He commends Benedict in the second book of his dialogues because he gave up liberal studies: “*Recessit igitur scienter nescius et sapienter indoctus.*”

Benedict himself was the author of a work that, though far less important than the Vulgate, presumably exercised great influence upon the Latin of the monasteries. This was the *Regula* of his order, written in the sixth century. The confusion of case after prepositions is even greater than in the Vulgate, and the extension in the use of the prepositions themselves is considerable. *Ab* is used with the ablative after comparatives, *meliores ab aliis*, 2, 46; *nihil a Christo carius*, 5, 3; in certain adverbial constructions, *a longo*, 7, 39; and with the accusative, *a caput*, 18, 53; *a Kalendas*, 48, 18. *De* is used with the genitive, *de prophetorum*, 14, 14; with the accusative, *de ordines*, 63, 1; in place of *ex*, *egredi de monasterio*, 29, 3; with ablative in place of partitive genitive, *ne aliquam de ovibus perdat*, 27, 13; *portio de vino*, 43, 33; *de eadem libra tertia pars*, 39, 9; also, like *ab*, with comparative, *amplius de media nocte*, 8, 4. We likewise find *cum* and *sine* used with the accusative, *ad* constructions for the dative, *diversus for varius* (divers), the omission of final letters, *lectione et versu* for *lectionem et versum*, 17, 12; and a confusion of the nominative and accusative forms, *audiamus Dominus—dicens*, 7, 35-§

Before leaving the subject of distinctively Church literature we might remark that in a translation like the Vulgate, made by men who doubtless used both Greek and Latin colloquially, but neither of them with scholarly accuracy, many Greek constructions were taken over into Latin without modification. Such are the genitive absolute and the gerundive with *in* for the Greek infinitive with the article and preposition. Where a construction that is apparently Greek persisted in the Middle Ages, however, it is probably safer to attribute it to plebeian Latin—where it may have been derived from the Greek anterior to the Christian period—than to the influence of later Christian literature. Classical Greek disappeared even more

* *Praef. Job.*; P. L.; *Non metacismi collisionem fugio, non barbarismi confusionem devito, situs motusque praepositionum casusque servare contemno, quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba caelestia oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati.*

† *Decretum Gratianum*, Pars Prima, Dist. 37: c. i., a decree of the council of Carthage, in 398.—*Libros gentilium non legat episcopus*; c. vii., *Legimus de beato Hieronymo quod dum libros legeret Ciceronis ab angelo correptus est, eo quod vir Christianus paganorum figmentis intenderet.*

‡ *Ep.*, 11, 54; P. L.: *In uno se ore cum Iovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt.*

§ This confusion of case forms and consequent extension in the use of prepositions was a phenomenon that could only occur while Latin was still spoken by the commons; for it depended primarily upon pronunciation. Such errors as appear in literature with Benedict had been common in the inscriptions from an early period, certainly from the second century on (C. I. L., Vol. 15). Final *s* was often omitted in classical times; we know that by the sixth century final *m* was regularly elided, and that there was no distinction made in the pronunciation of *ae*, *i* and *e* at the end of nouns; *u* and *o* had also become practically identical. The spoken noun, therefore, became as impotent to express case relations in Latin as it is in English. Cf. Sittl, *Zur Betheilung des sogenannten Mittellateins*, A. L. L., Vol. II., page 555.

completely than classical Latin from the curricula of the schools after the sixth century. Its sporadic persistence in the Irish cloisters and the Mediterranean ports had little or no effect upon mediæval literature.

The influence of political and social changes upon Latin is more manifest in profane than in religious literature. In this connection Gregory, Bishop of Tours, who wrote at the very close of the sixth century, is worthy of consideration for several reasons. He was really among the first of the mediæval chroniclers, and yet he wrote in the twilight of classical culture. His works occasionally give us a glimpse into the life of his age, and a view of the personality of the author and his relations to his contemporaries that is interesting, and goes far toward making his writings real literature. Gregory is still an individual, not a mere member of an order, like the monkish chroniclers. He was one of the last who wrote when Latin was still a spoken language among the commons.* It was his mother tongue.†

In addition to a work upon miracles, ecclesiastical lives, commentaries upon the psalms and a liturgical treatise *De Cursu Stellarum*, Gregory wrote a History of the Franks that comes as near to being a secular work as anything written by a bishop in the sixth century could. To be sure he begins, like Irving in Knickerbocker, with the creation, and he prefaces his work with a confession of faith. His lack of the historical critical faculty recalls the reflections of Robert Elsmere upon the authenticity of miracles. We are in an intellectual childhood compared with the age of Cicero or Livy. Gregory seems to start out with the mediæval assumption that the more incredible a thing is the greater the *a priori* probability of its being true. In fine, though Gregory writes like a man and not like a monk, in cast of thought, and to a great extent in literary style and language, with him the Middle Ages have already begun.

Gregory wrote before the nadir of political confusion and intellectual apathy had been reached; but he saw it approaching, and there was no affected pessimism in the depressing exordium to the preface of his history, where he laments the waning away and death of liberal culture in the Gallic cities.‡ He was not unconscious of his own inability to command a classical style, as we can infer from the frequent passages in his prefaces, notably the apostrophe to himself in the preface to the *Confessores*,§ probably the last important work that he ever wrote.

Though it will involve the repetition of some things noted in connection with religious literature, we can profitably sum up here those salient peculiarities of Mediæval Latin that appear in the works of Gregory, with additional illustrations occasionally from Anthimus, a Gallic writer who composed a work upon dialectics early in the following century. The reappearance of characteristic features of the

* Cf. Bonnet, o. c., introduction, page 23.

† Speaking of Orleans he says, *Et hinc lingua Syriorum, hinc Latinorum, hinc etiam ipsorum Iudæorum—concrepabat.* H. F., 8, 1.

‡ *Decedente, atque immo potius pereunte ab urbibus Gallicanis liberalium cultura litterarum, cum nunnulæ res gererentur vel recte vel improbe, ac feritas gentium desaeuisset, regum furor acueretur, ecclesiæ impugnarentur etc.*

§ *O rustice—qui nomina discernere nescis; qui saepius pro masculinis feminea, pro femineis neutra, et pro neutris masculina commutas; qui ipsas quoque praepositiones, quas nobilium dictatorum (sc. scriptorum) observari sanxit auctoritas, loco debito plerumque non locas; nam ablativis accusativa, et rursum accusativis ablativa praeponis.*

Vulgate is noticeable here, and we already have the key note of the changes upon which the various modulations of the Middle Ages were based.

I. VOCABULARY.

(1) Shades of meaning in classical words were lost, especially in case of diminutives, frequentatives, and compounds. *Infantulus* for *puer*, H. F., 6, 26; *cellula* for *cella*, H. F., 6, 29; *corpusculum* for *corpus*, 7, 46 et *passim*; *agitare* for *agere*, 1, 26; *defensare* for *defendere*, 3, 13; 5, 26, 9, 36, et *passim*; while such compounds occur as *delibare*, *sacrificia delibare*, 2, 10; *detruncabat*, 2, 4; *demanicatus*, mutilated, 7, 15; in *Burgundiam peraccessit*, 5, 13; *pacem firmavit*, 9, 11.*

(2) Classical words assume new meanings: *dictator* for *scriptor*, quoted above; *cellula* is chapel, 2, 14; *ordinare* is to ordain, 2, 41; *lapsus* is a net, 8, 10; *sponsare* is used for *nubere* or *uxorem ducere*, 9, 28; *porta* for *ostium*, 2, 38; *campum praeeparare* has about the same force as *sui potestatem facere* in Caesar, 2, 27; 4, 50, 5, 18, et *passim*; *agens* becomes a noun, meaning a public or private agent, 6, 19; 9, 35; *regestum* is used for *thesaurus*, 9, 9.

(3) A rare classical word displaces the usual classical word, sometimes with a slight modification of meaning, *manducare* occurs regularly for *edere* or *comedere* in Anthimus, and occasionally in Gregory; we also find in the former *caballus* and *caballicare* for *equus* and *equitare*. Water mills have displaced hand mills, and so *pistrinum* has given way to *molendina*, 3, 19. *Civitas* designates the seat of a bishop, 3, 19.

(4) Abstract and technical terms, of Greek origin or built up from Latin stems, appear. It is hardly necessary to give examples of these, as they are in most cases repetitions of words found in the Vulgate. Such expressions as *elemosynarius valde*, 6, 20; *clericatus officium*, 8, 15, *formula*, bench, whence our word 'form,' 8, 31, are perhaps worth nothing. There are also a number of new official designations that have either been brought in or given a special meaning with the Frankish rule. Among these are: *capitulare*, 9, 30; *camerarius*, 4, 26; *ducatus*, 8, 26; *maior domus*, 6, 45; 9, 30; *referendarius*, 5, 3; *descriptor*, 9, 30.

(5) A few barbarian words have been introduced. Such are the Celtic *agripennis* (arpent) *unus stadius habet agripennes quinque*, 1, 6; the German *scramasaxi*, *cum cultris validis, quos vulgo scramasaxos vocant*, 4, 51; *bacchinon* [Bacchus (?) or Becher] *cum pateris ligneis, quas vulgo bacchinon vocant*, 9, 28; *leudes*, 2, 42; *banni, bannos iussit exigi*, 5, 26.

(6) Words are sometimes employed in new relations. *Vir* is used, as *homo* is sometimes in earlier Latin, in lieu of a pronoun; *et ecce vir quasi de gravi somno suscitatus excutitur*, 7, 1. *Ille* and *unus* frequently occur with the force of articles—a use dating back as far as Cicero, but much less frequent in the classical age, and *unus—alius* are used for *alter—alter*, 1, 2. *Hora* is one of the words that tended to lose its nominal force. We find *ad horam, adora*, in An-

* The citations are from the edition of the History of the Franks by Arndt, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum, Tomus I*. The edition in the *Recueil des Historiens, Tom. II*, has been emended so as to lose its value for linguistic study. The edition of Du Cange has also been collated with the two mentioned, but without any effect upon the citations.

thimus, 11, with adverbial force, and *mala hora* (malheur) has already become an exclamation of inauspicious significance; *cum de porta egrediretur, uno carrucae effracto axe, omnes 'mala hora' dixerunt; quod a quibusdam pro auspicio susceptum est*, 6, 45. We have another foreshadowing of a French expression in *Ecce hic (ci-est) Maclivus mortuos et sepultus iacet*, 4, 4; and likewise in *reverentiam habere non sapuit* (sût.) 7, 29.

Etymology :

(1) There is a confusion of gender. Some twenty neuters and a very few feminines become masculine. The reverse is true occasionally. Neuters that become masculine are *acetum, consilium, corpusculum, ferrum, frigus, gaudium, ingenium, litus, linteum, meritum, monasterium, oppidum, pavimentum, regnum, robur, sputum, stadium, tentorium, territorium, tormentum*; and feminines becoming masculine are *crux, frons, frons, gens, hiems, urbs. Cibus, domus, lectulus, locus, populus, sarcophagus, stomachus, synodus, thalamus, thesaurus*; while *tumulus* together with *paries* becomes neuter. These are as a rule cases where the adjective or case construction indicates the gender; for the pronouns are so confused as to give very little evidence as to the gender of their antecedent. For instance we find *turrem qui*, 1, 6; *villam qui*, 9, 35; *pratam qui*, 3, 15; *quae liber*, 1, 44.

(2) In declension we find the singular of such words as *angustiae, insidiae, sarcinae* (*insidia* occurs in the Vulgate); and different declensions are confused, *non inmemor periurias*, 3, 7; *dolus* is confused with *dolor* (cf. Psalms, 23, 4), 5, 35; *contemptor pauperorum*, 4, 40; and in pronominal relations, *perillum ostium*, 7, 22; *hic filia*, 3, 31. The confusion of case in relative pronouns is as bad as the confusion of gender; *arborem plenam pomis, qua vulgo pruna vocant*, 3, 15; *milia aureorum, qua ille accipiens*, 3, 34; *Quae de causa*, 4, 41.

The relative and interrogative pronouns are interchanged in a few instances; *castrum—, quid defensatum est*, 3, 13; *Requirite quod de Carthaginensibus scibat Orhosius*, praef. V.

(4) The force of comparison is sometimes lost in the case of adjectives. This had been true in some irregular forms as early as Seneca, in whose epistle we find *proximior* (118). It is evidenced in Gregory by such examples as *valde nequissimus*, 5, 3, where we have a weakening of the superlative. Another similar instance is *vir sanctissimus atque religiosus*, 2, 21. On the other hand the comparative has by implication the force of the superlative in *de prima et, ut ita dicam, nobiliore suorum familia*, 2, 9. *Melior* has already the force of *le meilleur* in such expressions as *meliores natu*, those of highest rank, 6, 45, and *convocatis melioribus Francis*, in the same chapter.

(5) The irregularity in the inflection of verbs is very great, and we can only indicate by a few examples the sort of changes that took place. Deponent verbs become active, as in case of *admiror, admirabam quod erat*, 7, 22 (cf. Mark, 7, 37.—*Et eo amplius admirabant*); *carnes si frequenter utantur*, Anthimus, 4; and active verbs become deponent, *Provinciam ipsam lues debellata est*, 8, 39. There is a confusion of conjugations. *Odi* had already become a fourth conjugation verb in the Vulgate, and is thus quoted, "*Argue stultum, adiciet odire te*," 8, 40. Occasionally a third conjugation—*io* verb, such as *cupio*, becomes fourth

conjugation, *cum omnes cupirent regnare*, 2, 23. Doubtless from the analogy of *iacio* we have the form *iaceretur*, 1, 10. There are also other instances of non-classical forms of defective verbs, *Memineat*, praef. 2; *oportet te meminire*, 5, 43.

III. Syntax :

(1) Case : We have already had occasion to refer to the confusion of case after prepositions. In the thirty pages of Anthimus's *Epistola de Observatione Ciborum*, *de* is used about thirty times to express relations that would have been expressed by the genitive or by *ab* or *ex* constructions in classical Latin. *Super* is used in place of the dative, *ducem super septem civitates praeposuit*, 2, 20; but upon the whole there is an extension of the use of the dative in Gregory. It is used to express limit, in the well-known anecdote of the chalice of Soissons, *bipennem urceo impulit*, 2, 27; *altero te regno non mittam*, 5, 49; and with *damno*, *exilio damnaretur*, 2, 3. We also find the dative where we should expect *ab* with the ablative, *veniam legentibus precor*, praef. 1; and in place of a genitive, *cui meminimus*, 2, 7. The genitive of quality is used extensively; the ablative frequently usurps the place of the accusative in time and place relations; nominative and accusative absolutes are very common, and there is a general tendency to disregard the force of cases that manifests itself in ways too various to mention or illustrate.

(2) Mood and Tense : The infinitive is used to express purpose, *morbis nostris medere venturus erat*, 6, 5; *veni nuntiare dominae meae*, 7, 15; *nisi ipse eum descendisset redemere*, 6, 5; where a reminiscence of the Greek construction of the Vulgate is evident. The infinitive is usually replaced by the finite verb with *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam* in principal clauses of the indirect discourse. The indicative and subjunctive are used without distinction in indirect questions, *meminiat quantae strages fuere, quae amis oppraeserit humum*, praef. 2. The imperfect and pluperfect tenses tend to become equivalent, and in general temporal and modal relations are less strictly observed. Participial constructions assume great importance—*Chlogio—missis exploratoribus—perlustrata omnia, ipse secutus Romanos proteret*, 2, 9.

These instances illustrate the more obvious divergences of mediaeval from classical Latin. Barbarism in Latinity is a relative term, however, and it is impossible to set an exact date for its beginning. It was a matter partly of individual writers as well as of age. But we find in the writings of Gregory and his contemporaries, in a greater or less degree, most of the faults from which the humanists tried to free Latin at the time of the Renaissance. We must remember, however, that the literary barrenness of the Middle Ages was due primarily to the poverty of thought that begot poverty of expression, to the lack of mental discipline that manifested itself in paratactic sentences and slovenly orthography; and it needed only a change in these conditions to restore Latin to something of its former beauty and symmetry.

The ruin of Latin after the time of Gregory seems to have been speedy and complete. The royal capitularies and charters of this period testify as much for the official language,* while the character of the literature that followed is well

* A fairly representative passage of the barbarian legal Latin, though better than that of the Franks, is the following from the (Lombard) Edict of Rotharius, 328: M. G. H. *leges*, iv, page

illustrated in both form and content, by an extract from the life of Theodoric, quoted by Draeger in the introduction to his *Syntax*: "*Rex vero vocavit Eusebium, praefectum urbis Ticeni, et inaudito Boetio protulit in eum sententiam. Qui mox in agro Calventino, ubi in custodia habebatur, misit rex et fecit occidi. Qui accepta corde in fronte diutissime tortus est, ita ut oculi eius creparent. Sic sub tormenta ad ultimum cum fuste occiditur.*"

III.

While it is probably impossible to determine just when Latin ceased to exist as a spoken language among the common people, we have evidence that it lingered later than Gregory's time in some parts of the Empire. It was not necessarily in the centres of culture, however, that this vulgar patois of Latin persisted longest. Rather the very reverse was true in most instances. The dialects of Grisons and Sardinia are still those that resemble most closely the mother tongue of the Romance languages. Dante calls the Sardinians *simiae homines* from their imitation of Latin. But the question of peasant dialects, while it may be interesting from the standpoint of Romance philology, has very little to do with the transmission of literary Latin through the Middle Ages. What we are concerned with is the extent to which Latin was understood by people who, even though illiterate or nearly so, on account of their position in social and economic life correspond in a general way to what we now sometimes term the reading classes—townspeople and small landholders, traders and the better class of artisans and craftsmen, the Canterbury pilgrims of the latter half of the first decade of Christian centuries. It is natural to suppose that people of this class understood Latin and continued to employ it occasionally, long after it had ceased to be the ordinary medium of communication.

Latin continued throughout the Middle Ages to be the language of the Church liturgy, the law courts, and of both religious and secular instruction. In other words, it remained, if not the mother tongue, at least the adopted mother tongue of all the professional and official classes. This much, of course, is beyond question. How far it remained the vehicle for a popular literature during the early Middle Ages, before the vernacular tongue had taken its place, is less certain. Accentual rhythm and rhyme became thoroughly established in literary Latin, upon the same footing as classic metre, through the influence of the Christian hymns. But it is probable that contemporaneous with and antedating this—that is before the fall of the Western Empire—there was an equally vigorous and voluminous popular Latin literature of secular songs and rhythms.* In distant provinces, like Britain, if this ever gained a good foothold it soon disappeared. The literature of the Celtic bards had begun as early as the time of Gildas, the *ineptas saecularium hominum*

276, *Si animalis alienum animale occiderit aut intricaverit, id est bovis bovem aut quibustlibet peculiis, tunc dominus qui animale suum intricato invenerit aut forsitan iam marcitam aut minuatam, iubemus ut ille—qui animale suum intricatum aut forsitan mortuum invenit—ut det eum apud illum cuius animalis eum intricavit, et recipiat similem qualis in illa die fuit quando fragiatus est, ab ipso cuius animalis hoc fuit.* Note the difficulty that the writer of the law had with his antecedents and subordinate sentences, something characteristic of the untrained thinking of a rude age.

*The classical references to the popular songs of the Romans are given by Muratori, *Ant. Ital. Dissertatio XLma*. A collection of those extant is to be found in du Ménil, *Poésies Populaires Latines antérieures au XII^eme Siècle*.

fabulas of the sixty-sixth section of his *Epistola*. In the previous century Latin had practically disappeared from the Rhine country and the Lowlands,* and though we learn from Gregory that it was spoken at Orléans much later,† the Latin of Southern Gaul in the sixth century was probably a rustic dialect, to whose speakers the classical Latin of the Ciceronian period would have been wholly unintelligible, at least as a spoken language,‡ for we must remember that changes of pronunciation had been introduced which rendered the complex structure of the Roman sentence ambiguous, and the vocabulary had been so modified as to give an entirely new cast and color to the colloquial speech. But Latin was still spoken, and we learn from a life of St. Caesarius that in this same century the laity were accustomed to take part in the Church service at Arles in both Latin and Greek.§ By the time of Charlemagne, however, two centuries later, the Church songs had become so corrupted that teachers had to be imported from Italy to train the Gallic choirs,|| and we have references to a popular literature in the vulgar tongue.¶ It is probable that Latin ceased to be understood by the laity in Gaul in the seventh century—that is popular and Church Latin; for classical Latin must have been growing more and more of a puzzle to the average burgher for the past three centuries.**

In Italy, however, there was for some time no distinct vernacular tongue to take the place of Latin. Italy was also nearest the head of official Latin, the Roman Curia. Classical traditions and institutions were still preserved. It is probable that a popular Latin literature lingered later here than elsewhere.

Dante's characterization of the Roman dialect as *Italarum vulgarium omnium*

*Sidon. Apol. Epist., 4, 17; P. L., LVIII, and M. G. H. sc. ant., vol. viii, *Sermonis pompa Romani, si qua adhuc uspiam est, Belgicis olim sive Rhenanis abolita terris*.

† Cf. note page,

‡ Praef. H. F.: *quia philosophantem rhetorem intellegunt pauci, loquentem rusticum multi*. Even a century earlier Sidonius Apollinaris had said, Ep. 2, 10; P. L., LVIII, 486, B; and M. G. H. sc. Ant., viii: *Tantum increbuit multitudo desidiosorum ut, nisi vel paucissimi quique merum latinaris linguae proprietatem de trivialium barbarismorum robigine vindicaveritis, eam breve abolitam defleamus interitamque; sic omnium nobilium sermonum purpura per incuriam vulgi decolorabantur*.

§ Red. III, 384: *Adiecit et am atque compulit ut laicorum popularitas psalmos et hymnos pareret, aliatque et modulata voce, instar clericorum, alii Graece alii Latine prosas anti phonasque cantarent, ut non haberent spatium in ecclesia fabulis occupari*. This was about 510. The reference to the *fabulae* may refer to popular songs and tales; for we thus find a similar abuse as it was considered, had grown up in Italy in the ninth century. From the reference to the three languages spoken at Orleans in the quotation from Gregory given above, p. 9, and the passage just quoted one is led to infer that the case of intercommunication and extensive commercial intercourse between the different parts of the Empire during the later imperial period had given rise to a mélange of tongues and peoples in the trading cities of Gaul similar to that in the Levant at the present day.

¶ Rec. V, 185: *Franci naturali voce barbarica frangentes in guttore voces potius quam experimentes*.

¶ We also know that there was a native literature by Charlemagne's time, probably both Germanic and Romance. The former is referred to by the *barbara et antiquissima carmina, quibus veterum regum actus ac bella canebantur*. A note in du Ménil, page 234 of the *Poésies Populaires Latines antérieures au XII^{me} Siècle* gives the sources for early vernacular songs.

** Monceaux, *Rev. des deux Mondes*. Huttet goes much further in his views of the modification of the spoken speech: *si l'on avait parlé comme Sénèque ou comme Tacite, on n'aurait pas été compris dans les rues de Rome*, Monceaux is here speaking of the time of the Antonines.

turpissimum very possibly indicates that even by his time the speech of the Roman populace had not entirely freed itself from the *exuviae* of corrupted Latin idioms and grammatical forms. As late as 963, at the council held in Rome by Otto I. to depose Pope John XII., Luitprand, Bishop of Cremona, rendered into Latin the Saxon speech of the emperor for the benefit of all the Romans—*Romanis omnibus*—present.* Poggio, in his *Historia Convivialis*, mentions the fact that Latin was spoken by the women of Rome in his day, and that he had learned from them Latin words not known to him before.

In the vicinity of Naples also, where the Greek dominion lingered late and intercourse with the East continued active,† Latin may have been spoken, or at least understood by the middle classes as late as the ninth century. Though the evidence is a little slender, we are led to infer this from the existence of a popular ballad dating from about the year 872, written in a Latin that is rapidly assuming a modern form. The very barbarism of the language, and the feeling and dramatic energy of the piece—of which a portion only has been preserved—indicate that, though probably written by a member of the clerical order, it was doubtless intended for a popular auditory. This may be the last surviving fragment of a popular literature that one likes to imagine as dating back as far as the days of Horatius Cocles and the battle of Lake Regillus. The only evidence of mediaeval construction, apart from the language of course, is the abecedarium arrangement of the line initials. Louis the Second, son of Lothair, was imprisoned by one of his vassals at Beneventum, while returning from an expedition against the Saracens. The minstrel, if we may so call the author, thus expressed his indignation at an act that was to him almost a sacrilege :

“*Audite omnes fines terrae ore cum tristitia,
Quale scelus fuit factum Benevento civitas.
Lhudovicum comprehenderunt sancto pio augusto.
Beneventani se adunarunt ad unum consilium.
Adalferio loquebantur et dicebant principi :*
“*Si nos eum vivum dimitemus, certe nos peribimus.*
(s) *Celus magnum preparavit in istam provinciam ;
Regnum nostrum nobis tollit ; nos habet pro nihilum.
Plures mala nobis fecit. Rectum est ut moriad.*” ‡

Muratori also quotes a watch song, sung by the soldiers in the defense of Modena from the Huns, about half a century later. The Latin is better, the resemblance to Church hymns more apparent, and the popular character less evident. The opening lines are :

* *Concliorum Tomus XXI. (1644)* contains the proceedings of this council in brief: *His auditis Imperator, quia Romane euis loquelam, id est Saxoniam, intelligere interpreprando, Cremonense episcopo, praecepit ut Latino sermone haec Romanis omnibus qua nequibant sequenuten exprimeret.* Besides the clergy and nobles there were present *Benedictus cum Bulgarneno filio ex plebe, Petrusque et imperiola est dictus, cum omni Romanorum militia.*

† It must be remembered that Naples retained her independence from the time of Justinian to the end of the twelfth century.

‡ This was first published by Muratori at the end of his forty-fourth dissertation, *De Rhythmica* (Ant. Ital.). A translation is given by Fauriel, o. c., II, page 345. The poem is also found in du Méril, o. c., page 264, under the title, *Chanson des Soldats de Louis II.*

*" Oh, tu, qui servas armis ista moenia,
Noli dormire, moneo, sed vigila;
Dum Hector vigil exstitit in Troia,
Non eam cepit fraudulenta Graecia." **

It is not necessary to suppose, however, that military songs or Church songs, even though sung by the people at large, imply the colloquial use of Latin in every-day life. It is probable that songs, the chorus of which at least was Latin, were sung by the soldiers during the Crusades. †

It is probable then that Latin was well enough understood by the middle classes of Italy as late as the tenth century, to make a quasi popular literature in that language possible. There was, however, a vulgar dialect, probably neither Italian or Latin, but something between the two, that formed the conversational medium of the Italians during this period, while Latin was spoken with at least an intelligent attempt at grammatical correctness by the better educated class of monks and other ecclesiastics. ‡ Legal and Church Latin must have continued to be familiar to the great body of the townspeople and country aristocracy much longer, through the influence of the law courts and the Church liturgy. We shall have occasion to note later that Latin seems to have been just giving way to the vernacular dialects in court literature at the time of Dante. When we consider, however, what a number of Latin phrases, such as *sine die*, *bona fide*, *ex tempore*, have made themselves at home even in our own language, it becomes easier for us to realize to what a large extent the simpler colloquial forms of Latin, and the technical terms of the Church and the court room must have been understood even by the illiterate classes in Italy at a time when their own tongue still retained a vivid consciousness of its own immediate descent from that language. It is a question, however, whether this very fact, that Italian and Latin were so closely related, did not oftentimes favor the introduction of vulgar idioms and barbarous terms into the literary language. Gonzon seems to imply this in his defense, and Erasmus, many centuries later, considers that affinity of tongues is an obstacle to purity of diction. § Be this as it may, we see very little evidence of Latin letters having received any strain of natural, native vigor through the longer continuance of Latin as a spoken tongue in Italy. In many respects the Italian style was better, on account of the earlier recovery or continued study of secular letters south of the Alps. If Latin in literature received any inspiration from the

* The whole poem is found in du Ménil, o. c., page 268.

† Of this sort probably was the song *Ultreia* (*ultra eia*) mentioned by Fauriel, o. c., II; Du Ménil, o. c., 297, gives a *Chant pour la première Croisade*; other crusade songs are also given on pages 408-415 of the same work.

‡ We infer this from the anecdote related of Gonzon (Martenne, *Amplissima Collectio*, I, 297) an Italian ecclesiastic, who was summoned to attend Otto I, in Germany, upon some special mission, about the year 960. He was entertained at the monastery of St. Gall while on this trip, and in the course of his conversation with the monks chanced to use an accusative where the strict Latin rule requires the dative. He was unmercifully ridiculed by his hosts for this solecism and defended himself later in a long letter in which he says, *Falso putavit Sancti Galli monachus me remotum a scientia grammaticae artis, licet aliquanto retarder usu nostrae vulgaris linguae, quae Latinitati vicina est.*

§ *Videtur affinitas obstare puritati. Citius enim pure Romane loquetur Hibernus quam Gallus aut Hispanus.*

people in Italy, it is to be found in the Christian hymns. As a rule it was as artificial here as everywhere, more so perhaps than in the Anglo-Saxon schools.*

IV.

When, after the long reign of anarchy in the North, political conditions again gave encouragement and inspiration to literature, a concomitant change for the better is also noticeable in the language. The Carolingian Age marks a sharp division in the literary history of Latin. That language had ceased to be spoken by the people, which is but another way of saying that it had ceased to be modified by colloquial usage. Its period of endogenous transformation was past. There was no longer to be a growth of new words based directly, and of new grammatical forms based indirectly, upon principles of vocalization. Popular literature in that language had ceased. It had become a book language, and though as such still living, and undergoing modification in accordance with linguistic laws, the character of this modification received its stamp from the caste by which the language was employed. This is true even when, as we shall see at the close of the period of scholastic Latin which now begins, it again descends into the streets, jostles against the vulgar tongues, and again becomes for the last time the vehicle for popular song and story.

The literary influence of the Carolingian Age was two-fold. It brought learning into good repute, and it furnished material for writers. It gave men something to think and to write about, and inspired the Romance literature of the following centuries. Saxon in its origin, Teutonic in its temperament and character, the Carolingian influence added something even to Latin literature that it could not have derived from any classical source. Latin had lost infinitely more than it could ever recover; but the infusion of new elements gave it features that it never had possessed before.

That Saxon influences should have predominated over Italian at the court of Charles was probably due more to ethnic sympathies and the broader and more serious culture of the English schools, than to superiority in the graces of rhetoric and style on the part of the Northumbrian monks. In fact even here grammar seems to have been regarded as an Italian specialty. But literary inspiration, the enthusiasm that makes learning a sort of cult, had been strongest in England. It is often attitude toward culture as much as culture itself that makes a nation the centre of a literary revival, and in the seventh century the Renaissance spirit was strong in England, and weak in Italy.†

The reign of Charles produced, besides a theological literature of imposing proportions, a vast body of poetry, epistles, and historical writings, all based more or less consciously upon classical models. This reign also saw the first attempt to

* Bede, in his *History of the English*, I, 1, names Latin as one of the five languages of Britain; and this statement is borrowed without modification by later chroniclers. We hear also of an English bishop who spoke Greek and Latin as fluently as his native tongue. We might assume then that Latin continued to be a sort of class language in the Hiberno-Saxon culture area during this period to such an extent that no distinction was drawn between it and the vernacular as a living language.

† The principal teacher in Italy at this time seems to have been Dungallus, a Scotch or Irish monk, cf. Muratori, *Diss. XXIV^{ma}, De Litterarum Statu in Italia in Seculis IX et X.*

restore the corrupted text of the Vulgate—the earliest essay, so far as we know, in the history of Latin, at the critical restoration of a literary work. The conception of the reëstablishment of the Western Empire, a perfectly serious, sober thing to the men who took part in trying to realize it, created a new attitude toward Roman literature. The little coterie of literary men at the court of Charles donned Roman names along with their other imperial fancies. Alcuin became Flaccus, Angilbert Homer, and a writer of courtly eclogues has left no other name to posterity than Naso.

✱ Alcuin was naturally the leader of this revival. Though he seems to have been one of those men who exercise a greater influence through their personality than through their pen, he has left us writings that are voluminous—perhaps unnecessarily so, considering their contents—and that are so thoroughly characteristic of the age in which he wrote as to be fairly representative of the whole literature of the period. His prose is deformed by the technical and abstract cast which theology gave to literature when its influence was not modified by the serious rivalry of any other form of letters, and, especially in his correspondence, by the never ending complimentary formulas that the courtesy of the time demanded. In other words we have the beginning of the scholastic style. Parallel with this there is something that impresses a modern reader as being cant, an overloading of the text with moral reflections, pious exhortation and religious admonitions that are very tiresome to the nineteenth century reader.

There is one feature of this Teutonic Latinity, however, that is not altogether uninteresting; and that is the peculiar manifestation of the Romantic spirit that reveals itself in love for themes treating of outdoor life, and especially of spring. Roman Latin was distinctively urban, and when it did venture beyond its walls it was only to take a practical utilitarian, *de re rustica* survey of the surrounding fields and meadows. Romanticism in the form of an emphasis of subjectivity through solitude and an environment of nature—though suggested occasionally in mediæval literature, especially in the writings of St. Bernard—first definitively enters Latin literature with Petrarch. But the following, from Alcuin, almost reminds us of Chaucer in its buoyant spring joyousness :

Nunc cuculus ramis etiam resonavit in altis ;
 Florea versicolor pariet nunc germina tellus ;
 Vineæ bachiferas trudit de palmite gemmas,
 Suscitât et vario nostras modulamine mentes
 Indefessa satis rutulis lusciniâ ruscis.

Another poem sometimes ascribed to Alcuin,* and more Romantic than classical in its spirit, is interesting as the first example we have of a disputation in verse—one of the means by which scholasticism later invaded the realm of poetry. It is given entire, not only because it represents the best Latin verse written at this period, but also because it illustrates the Germanic attitude which the poet assumed toward his theme.

* It was formerly ascribed to Bede or to Milo, and later, by Ebert, o. c., II, 68, to Dodo. Dümmler thinks it was addressed to Dodo. Cf. *Zeitschrift für Deut. Alt.*, XII, 448; *Rhein. Mus.*, XXX, 621-28.

CONFLICTUS VERIS ET HIEMIS.

Conveniunt subito cuncti de montibus altis
 Pastores pecudum vernali luce sub umbra
 Arborea, pariter laetas celebrare Camenas.
 Adfuit et iuvenis Dafnis seniorque Palaemon;
 Omnes hi cuculo laudes cantare parabant.
 Ver quoque florigero succinctus stemmate venit,
 Frigida venit Hiems, rigidis hirsuta capillis.
 His certamen erat cuculi de carmine grande.
 Ver prior adludit ternos modulamine versus.

Ver: "Opto meus veniat cuculus, carissimus ales,
 Omnibus iste solet fieri gratissimus hospes
 In tectis, modulans rutulo bona carmina rostro."

Tum glacialis Hiems respondit voce severa:

Hiems: "Non veniat cuculus, nigris sed dormiat antris.
 Iste famem secum semper portare suescit."

Ver: "Opto meus veniat cuculus cum germine laeto,
 Frigora depellat, Phoebos comes almus in aevum.
 Phoebus amat cuculum crescenti luce serena."

Hiems: "Non veniat cuculus, generat qui forte labores,
 Proelia congeminat, requiem disiungit amatam,
 Omnia disturbat; pelagi terraeque laborant."

Ver: "Quid tu, tarde Hiems, cuculo convicia cantas?
 Qui torpore gravi tenebrosis tectus in antris
 Post epulas Veneris, post stulti pocula Bacchi—"

Hiems: "Sunt mihi divitiae, sunt et convivia laeta,
 Est requies dulcis, calidus est ignis in aede.
 Haec cuculus nescit, sed perfidus ille laborat."

Ver: "Ore feret flores cuculus et mella ministrat,
 Aedificatque domos, placidas et navigat undas,
 Et generat suboles, laetos et vestiet agros."

Hiems: "Haec inimica mihi sunt, quae tibi laeta videntur.
 Sed placet optatas gazas numerare per arcas
 Et gaudere cibus simul et requiescere semper."

Ver: "Quis tibi, tarde Hiems, semper dormire paratus,
 Divitias cumulat, gazas vel congregat ullas,
 Si ver vel aestas ante tibi nulla laborant?"

Hiems: "Vera refers: illi, quoniam mihi multa laborant,
 Sunt etiam servi nostra ditone subacti,
 Iam mihi servantes domino, quaecumque laborant."

Ver.: "Non illis dominus, sed pauper inopsque superbus,
Nec te iam poteris per te tu pascere tantum,
Ni tibi qui veniet cuculus alimonia præstet."

Tum respondit ovans sublimi e sede Palaemon
Et Dafnis pariter, pastorum et turba piorum :

"Desine plura, Hiems ; rerum tu prodigus, atrox,
Et veniat cuculus, pastorum dulcis amicus.
Collibus in nostris erumpant germina laeta,
Pascua sint pecori, requies et dulcis in arvis,
Et virides rami præstent umbracula fessis,
Uberibus plenius veniantque ad mulctra capellæ,
Et volucres varia Phœbum sub voce saluent.
Quapropter citius cuculus nunc ecce venito !
Tu iam, dulcis amor, cunctis gratissimus hospes,
Omnia te expectant, pelagus, tellusque polusque,
Salve, dulce decus, cuculus per sæcula salve !"

There is more than occasionally an echo from Vergil or Horace in the poem. *His certamen erat cuculi de carmine grande* was suggested by *Et certamen erat, Corydon cum Thyrside*, magnum of the seventh eclogue ; *Desine plura, Hiems*, has its parallel in *Desine plura, puer*, which Vergil uses in both the fifth and the ninth eclogue ; *glacialis hiems* occurs also in the third Aeneid, line 285. The first ode of Horace, of the first book, opens with *dulce decus*, which appears in the last line of the *Conflictus*, and *ad mulctra capellæ* is found in the sixteenth epode. But these show really little more than vague, unintentional reminiscences. On the other hand, nearly half of the lines are leonine, some with complete rhymes—*rutilo bona carmina rostro ; nigris sed dormiat antris ; laetos et vestiet agros ; pastorum et turba piorum*.^{*} There is also the Saxon love of alliteration ; *secum semper portare suescit ; cuculo convicia cantas ; Nec te iam poteris per te tu pascere tantum*. Furthermore, the first sentence, the first three lines of the poem, is bound together by two leonines and two series of alliteration. This is sufficient to show perhaps how thoroughly Teutonic in structure the Latin verse of the Carolingian period is, and how slightly the literary influence of Italy was felt by the writers of the North. But the whole spirit of the poem, the idea of the disputation, the personification of spring and winter, the association of the cuckoo with spring, the allusions to treasures and dark caverns, the connection of winter with banquets and a warm fire, with comfort and physical ease, and of spring with labor and battle and voyages, are all Teutonic, and are ideas that received their emphasis first in the literature of the northern lands. The fact that they determine the tone and color of Carolingian poetry shows that the ninth century revival was not merely an imitative one, like that in Italy four centuries later, but was one pregnant with original impulse, with an entirely new range of literary concepts, which never found complete expression in Latin, but was fully realized only with the maturity of the vernacular literature.

As has already been intimated, Alcuin's importance as a teacher was greater

^{*}For this reason I should read *cunctis* in the first line.

than as a writer. He carried to the palace school of Charles and the monastery of Tours the learning that had survived in Ireland and Northumbria during the time when barbarian invasion and political confusion had swept it away from western Europe. Even some knowledge of Greek was kept alive in this northern retreat,* and there was a vein of reasonably good Latin running through the culture which the English monastic schools, transmitted through Bede, Egbert, and Aelbert to the York scholar;† which was so to speak domiciled by him at Tours, and carried on later, by way of Fulda, through various channels to St. Gall, where many a classic author slept for centuries before being awakened by the spring sunshine of the Renaissance. Alcuin thus sums up the literary treasures of York :

Illic invenies veterum vestigia patrum,
 Quidquid habet pro se Latino Romanus in orbe,
 Graecia vel quidquid transmisit clara Latinis,
 Hebraeicus vel quod populus bibit imbre superno,
 Africa luciplus vel quidquid lumine sparsit :
 Quod pater Hieronimus, quod sensit Hilarius atque
 Ambrosius praesul, simul Augustinus et ipse
 Sanctus Athanasius, quod Orsius edit avitus ;
 Quidquid Gregorius summus docet et Leo papa ;
 Basilius quidquid ; Fulgentius atque coruscant
 Cassiodorus item, Chrysostomus atque Iohannes ;
 Quidquid et Althelmus docuit, quid Beda magister,
 Quae Victorinus scripsere Boëtius atque ;
 Historici veteres, Pompeius, Plinius, ipse
 Acer Aristoteles, rhetor quoque Tullius ingens ;
 Quid quoque Sedulius, vel quid canit ipse Iuvenius,
 Alcimius et Clemens, Prosper, Paulinus, Arator ;
 Quid Fortunatus, vel quid Lactantius edunt ;
 Quae Maro Virgilius, Statius, Lucanus et auctor
 Artis grammaticae vel quid scripsere magistri,
 Quid Probus atque Focas, Donatus Priscianusve,
 Servius, Euticius, Pompeius, Comminianus.

Alcuin, as we have seen, was familiar with Horace also. The fact that he is not mentioned here, and that Ovid, whose *Ars Amatoria* (I, 91) suggested the first line of this very quotation, is overlooked, was probably due to an oversight or to the difficulty of working them into the metre ; for we can hardly assume that they were to be found only upon the Continent at this time, and had they been in England they doubtless would have been at York. This list, however, is as expressive on account of its arrangement and for what it lacks as for what it contains. The Church Fathers, naturally, come first ; Cicero is commended as a

* In the *Chronicon Florentii Wigomiensis*, anno 726 P. C. Tobias Hrofensis, ecclesiae praesul, defunctus est, qui ita Graecam cum Latina didicit linguam, ut tam notas ac familiares sibi eas quam naturalis suae, id est Anglicae, loquelam haberet. M. H. B. I., 541 D.

† Cf. Bede, in M. H. B. I., 109 A: *Quinque gentium linguis (i)etenetur Britanni Anglorum, Brittonum, Scotorum, Pictorum, Latinorum, quae meditatione scripturarum ceteris omnibus est facta communis.*

master of style ; the other authors are mixed in an inextricable jumble to suit the demands of the measure, without any attempt either direct or indirect to express a literary judgment upon them. To Alcuin apparently they were upon the same plane, and he formed no critical opinion, according to classical or modern criteria at least, as to their relative importance. There is a hint in Alcuin's work on orthography that the various pronunciation of the Late Empire had been perpetuated among the monks. He directs them to write *vinea* with an *i* in the first syllable, and *e* in the second when vine is meant, and with *i* in the second and *e* in the first when pardon is intended ; to commence *vacca* with *v* for cow and *b* for berry ; and similarly not to confound *vellus* and *bellus*, *fel* and *vel*, *beneficus* and *veneficus*, *bibo* and *vivo*.*

Though Alcuin wrote in the midst of a period of considerable intellectual activity, neither he or his contemporaries produced anything of great permanent value from a purely literary point of view. The personality of the writers does not shine through their works. Monasticism and ecclesiasticism are not usually favorable to the development of that degree of individuality and mental and moral independence which is necessary in order that genius may recognize itself or receive recognition from others. Alcuin occasionally wrote something, however, that came very near to having a touch of true poetry about it. The following evening prayer is more distinctively Christian in its spirit than anything quoted before, and there are an ease and an appropriateness in the expression and feeling of the piece that are akin to literary merit if not to poetic inspiration :

ORATIO IN NOCTE.

Qui placido in puppi carpebat pectore somnum,
Exurgens ventis imperat et pelago :
Fessa labore gravi quamvis hic membra quiescant,
Ad se concedat cor vigilare meum.
Agne Dei, mundi qui crimina cuncta tulisti,
Conserva requiem mitis ab hoste meam.

During the two centuries following the reign of Charles, in the disorder attending the last great invasion from the north, letters suffered a second eclipse, though one not so total as that which had accompanied the anarchy of the Merovingian period. In the monasteries the classic authors were still read and studied, and furnished their grist of centos for the monkish annalists and verse makers. A favorite metre, especially for those metrical lives of the saints that formed one of the staple products of the literary activity of this time, was the leonine hexameter, which appeared towards the close of the ninth century with a one syllabled rhyme and by the beginning of the twelfth century, with a more fully developed two syllable rhyme, became the predominant form of verse. One scholastic grammarian says that it got its name from the fact that, like the lion, its principal power resided in its breast and its tail. It was a rather serious matter to write poetry under the restrictions which this metre imposed. The two halves of the hexameter must rhyme, no hiatus and no elision were allowed, and the strictest writers apparently

* Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, VII, 295 et seq. These directions are partly traditional, of course, and are copied from the late Latin grammarians.

admitted no spondaic verses. Of course writing poetry became a matter of cleverness rather than of inspiration under these conditions.* A poem was something like those acrostics with which the mediaeval writers amused themselves, or the ingenious letter of Petrarch, which can be read either backwards or forwards with a reversal of meaning. Alliteration, which was favored by the Romans themselves, especially during the period of decadence, and was still more popular with the Teutonic nations, was forced to such an extent as to add still further to the artificiality of the verse. To illustrate, in Theofridus's metrical life of Willibrodus such examples as the following occur, not rarely but repeatedly:

Sane terit terram non tanto tempore tactam (III, 76), and ten lines farther on, *Mentem maternam mutans imitata novercam*. The natural result was that rules of metre came to be more important in the eyes of the writers than rules of grammar; and grammatical correctness was consequently sacrificed to the demands of the verse.†

However, these metrical lives give us some information as to the classical works preserved and read in the monasteries. In Theofridus and the *Vitae Sanctorum*‡ we find centos and allusions to passages in the following profane authors: Cicero, the Phillipics and Catilinarian orations, de Inventione, de Natura Deorum; Horace, all the works; Juvenal, all the satires; Livy, book twenty-two; Lucan; Lucretius; Macrobius; Martial; Ovid, all the works; Persius, Prologue and satires iii., iv., and v.; Phaedrus; Pliny, Natural History; Propertius; Sallust, the Catiline and Jugurtha; Seneca, the Phaedra, Hercules Oetaeus, de Ira, Epistles; Servius; Silius Italicus; Statius; Terence, the Adelphi and Eunuchus; Tibullus; Valerius Flaccus; Vergil, all the authentic works.

V.

We have a poem written in the first half of the tenth century, and leaning to the classical metres in form, but thoroughly Teutonic in spirit, that in some ways indicates the high-water mark of pure literature in Mediaeval Latin. This is the epic *Waltharius*, though founded on German legend in its Latin form a youthful work of Ekkehart, a monk and later abbot of St. Gall. An intrinsically interesting theme is treated with good taste and dramatic skill and vigor in Latin which, though far from classical, never fails to give fitting expression to the thought. The sentiment of the piece is noble, and poetic genius hovers over it even where it does not inspire the verse.

Walter of Aquitaine is a hero of Teutonic fiction, dating back to the Niebelungen times and to the court of Attila, the "Scourge of God," who, though he may not be the particular monarch figuring in this story, has attracted to himself or im-

*Scholastic distinctions crept into prosody. Hexameters were classified as consonantes, leonini, caudati, peractherici, repercussivi, pariles, dactylici, reciproci, retrogradi, concatenati, intercorsi, circulati, and citocadi. Hubatsch, op. cit., 7. Some of these terms are explained in Thurot, op. cit.

† Indeed these writers were sometimes ignorant of grammar, or at least frankly acknowledged the fact that they disregarded it, like Gregory the Great, in sacred subjects; "*Si quis movetur rusticitate sermonis solecismorumque inconcinnitatibus, quas minime vitare studui, audiat quia regnum Dei non est in sermone*," etc., quoted by Comparetti, op. cit., p. 88, note 35.

‡ See bibliography.

parted something of his own history to all the incidents of romance that gathered about his ancestors. We see evidence of the old German poem or poems upon which Ekkehart's epic is based in the simplicity of exposition.

Tertia pars orbis, fratres, Europa vocatur,
Moribus ac linguis varias et nomine gentes
Distinguens cultu, tum religione sequestrans;
Inter quas gens Pannoniae residere probatur,
Quam tamen et Hunnos plerumque vocare solemus,
Hic populus fortis virtute vigeat et armis,
Non circum positas solum domitans regiones,
Littoris Oceani sed pertransiverat oras,
Foedera supplicibus donans sternensque rebelles.

Though Grimm calls these lines "*bloss mönchisch*," and *fratres* certainly suggests the reader in the refectory, the simplicity of the exordium and the direct, unpretentious beginning add charm to the story, especially when we contrast it with the elaborate artificiality of scholastic and Renaissance poetry. There is no invocation of the Muses, no classical allusion, no pedantic display of erudition; nor are we suddenly immersed in a chill cloistral atmosphere of beads and miracles. We are going to hear a story, with more of the ring of the ballad than of the stateliness of the epic in it, perhaps; but there is an intimation that we are getting through the integument and down to the quick of literature again.

Attila, king of the Huns, wishing to renew the ancient triumphs of his race, gives orders to advance against the Franks, whose seat of power at this time was the upper valley of the Rhine. The Frankish king, Gibicho, terrified by reports of the hostile army,

cuneum

Vincentem numero stellas atque amnis arenos,

after calling a council of the nobles decides to send Attila his submission, with tribute, and, as the young prince Guntharius is too young to be separated from his mother, his liegeman Hagano as hostage. Attila accepts the submission of the Franks, and later that of the Burgundians and Aquitanians, from whom come as hostages respectively the Princess Hiltgund and Prince Walter, who are already betrothed by order of their parents.

Attila, with the generous magnanimity of a hero of romance, is represented as indulging in noble sentiments, and preferring peace to war—albeit his professions are a little inconsistent with his practices:

Foedera plus cupio quam proelia mittere vulgo.
Pace quidem Hunni malunt regnare, sed armis
Inviti feriunt quos cernunt esse rebelles.

The young hostages are brought up at his court as though under a father's care. Hagano and Waltharius, trained in the arts of war and the schools:

Robore vincebant fortes, animoque sophistas,
Donec iam cunctos superarent fortiter Hunnos.

Meanwhile Hiltgunt, who is under the care of the queen, wins the love and confidence of her mistress, and is entrusted with the care of the treasure chamber. In the course of time, when the young people have attained maturity, the Frankish king dies and Prince Guntharius ascends the throne. As he refuses to pay further tribute to the Huns, Hagano flees by night to the court of his master.

Warned by the example of Hagano, Attila, upon advice of the queen, strives to attach Waltharius more closely to himself by an alliance with some princess of the Huns. The royal treasure shall eke out the scanty fortune of the groom :

“*Amplificabo quidem pariter te rure domique,
Nec quisquam, qui dat sponsam, post facta pudebit.*”

Waltharius, however, has already conceived a passion for Hiltgunt, and manages to evade the king's unwelcome generosity upon a plea of devotion to public duty :

“*Si nuptam accipiam domini praecepta secundum,
Vinciar in primis curis et amore puellae,
Atque a servitio regis plerumque retardor ;
Aedificare domos, cultumque intendere ruris
Cogor, et hoc oculis senioris adesse moratur,
Et solitam regno Hunnorum impendere curam.
Namque voluptatem quisquis gustaverit, exin
Intolerabilius consuevit ferre labores.*”

Attila, satisfied as to the fidelity of his hostage, ceases to urge an unwelcome wedlock upon him. A recently conquered vassal tribe rebels, and Waltharius leads the royal army against them. There is a vivid description of the battle ; for fighting is what most inspired the original author of the legend :

*Ecce locum pugnae conspexerit, et numeratum
Per latos aciem campos digessit et agros,
Iamque infra iactum teli congressus uterque
Constiterat cuneus ; tunc undique clamor ad auras
Tollitur, horrendam confundunt classica vocem,
Continuoque hastae volitant hinc indeque densae.
Fraxinus et cornus ludum miscebant in unum,
Fulminis inque modum cuspis vibrata micabat,
Ac, veluti Boreae sub tempore nix glomerata
Spargitur, haud aliter saevas iecere sagittas.
Postremum cunctis utroque ex agmine pilis
Absumptis, manus ad mucronem vertitur omnis,
Fulmineos promunt enses, clipeosque revolvunt,
Concurrunt acies demum, pugnamque restaurant ;
Pectoribus partim rumpuntur pectora equorum,
Sternitur et quaedam pars duro umbone virorum.*

Wherever Waltharius appears, mowing down the ranks before him like ripe crops under the sickle, the enemy cast aside their shields and, giving free rein to their horses, make way for him. At last the battle is won, and the young victor returns crowned with laurel to receive the congratulations of the courtiers.

As soon as the first inquiries and accounts of the fight are over, Waltharius seeks repose in the palace and finds Hiltgunt alone. Over a beaker of wine that she brings for his refreshment, he reminds the princess of their early betrothal, and proposes flight and marriage. The maiden at first distrusts the sincerity of the proposal :

“Quid lingua simulas quod ab imo pectore damnas,
Oreque persuades toto quod corde refutas?
Sit veluti talem pudor ingens ducere nuptam.”

Waltharius protests his sincerity, and that he should have fled to his fatherland long before,

Si non Hiltgundem solam remanere dolerem.

The maiden consents and the flight is arranged. Waltharius invites the king and the nobles to a sumptuous banquet, where the wine flows freely until the guests, overcome with food and liberal potations, sink into slumber. In the meantime the fugitives, with a Homeric disregard for the niceties of property right, supply themselves abundantly from the treasure-house of the king, and well armed and equipped set out on their homeward journey. At dawn they conceal themselves in a forest, where they spend an anxious day :

In tantum timor muliebria pectora pulsat,
Horreat ut cunctos aurae ventique susurros,
Formidans volucres, collisos sive racemos;
Hinc odium exilii, patriae amor incubat inde.

The scene in the banquet when the guests awake and find their host missing is quite realistic :

Attila nempe manu caput amplexatus utraque
Egreditur thalamo rex, Walthariumque dolendo
Advocat ut proprium quereretur forte dolorem.

The king's anger and grief at the flight of the hostages is extreme, and his varying mood finds free expression in his words. He abstains from food and passes a restless night :

Namque ubi nox rebus iam dempserat atra colores,
Decidit in lectum, verum nec lumina clausit,
Nunc latus in dextrum fultus, nunc inque sinistrum,
Et veluti iaculo pectus transfixus acuto
Palpitat, atque caput huc et mox iactitat illuc,
Et modo subrectus fulcro consederat amens.

At the council on the following day none of the nobles volunteer, even under the stimulus of a large reward, to pursue and recover a hostage with whose prowess they are so familiar. Waltharius and Hiltgunt continue unmolested for their four days' journey to the Rhine. News of the passage of the fugitives is carried at once to the Frankish king, at Worms, and he suspects their identity. Guntharius is represented as a true robber knight, and despite the dissuasion of Hageno, to whom both friendship and prudence make an attack upon his old companion at arms distasteful, he sets out with twelve followers to intercept the strangers and relieve

them of their treasure. Waltharius and Hiltgunt are overtaken when encamped in a rocky pass of the Vosges, where the former gives battle to his pursuers and kills in turn eleven of the companions of Guntharius. A description of the successive combats, and the dialogues that in some instances precede them form the major part of the remainder of the poem. The interest here is centered in the sixth contest. Patavrid, the nephew of Hagano, advances to win the king's reward and avenge his slain companions. The unhappy uncle, who refuses to take active part in an exploit, the melancholy outcome of which he already forebodes, tries in vain to restrain the impetuous ardor of the youth :

“ Quonam ruis ? Aspice mortem,
Qualiter arridet ! desiste. En ultima Parcae
Fila legunt. O care nepos, te mens tua fallit.
Desine. Waltharii tu denique viribus impar.”

But the boy rushes undaunted to the combat, and Hagano imprecates the *auri sacra fames* that has brought disaster upon his sovereign and his house :

“ O vortex mundi, fames insatiata habendi !
Gurges avaritiae, cunctorum fibra malorum !
O utinam solum glutires, dira, metallum
Divitiasque alias, homines impune remittens.
* * * * *
En caecus mortem properat gustare nefandum,
Et vili pro laude cupit descendere ad umbras.
Heu mihi, care nepos, matri quid, perditæ, mandas ?
Quis nuper ductam refovebit, care, maritam,
Cui nec, rapte, spei pueri ludicra dedisti ?
Quis tibi nam furor est ? Unde hæc dementia venit ?”
Sic ait et gremium lacrimis conspersit obortis,
Et, “ Longum, formose, vale,” singultibus edit.

Waltharius surmises the occasion of his friend's grief from afar, and himself tries to dissuade the youth from the combat. The young man, however, only answers his opponent's advice with taunts :

Dixit, et in verbo nodosam destinat hastem,
Cuspide quam propria divertens transtulit heros,
Quæ subvecta coris ac viribus acta furentis
In castrum venit atque pedes stetit ante puellæ.
Ipsa metu perculsa sonum prompsit muliebrem ;
At, postquam tenuis redit in præcordia virtus,
Paulum respiciens spectat num viveret heros.

Again Waltharius bids his young adversary retire from the unequal contest, but his words have no other effect than to render him the more determined to continue the combat :

At ille furens gladium nudavit et ipsum
 Incurrens petit, vulnusque a vertice librat.
 Alpharides parmam demum concusserat aptam,
 Et spumantis apri frendens de more tacebat.
 Ille ferire volens se pronior omnem ad ictum
 Exposuit ; sed Waltharius sub tegmine flexus
 Delituit, corpusque suum contraxit, et ecce
 Vulnere delusus juvenis recidebat ineptus.
 Finis erat ; nisi quod genibus tellure refixis
 Belliger accubuit, calibemque sub orbe cavebat.
 Hic dum consurgit, pariter se subrigit ille,
 Ac citius scutum trepidus sibi prætulit, atque
 Frustra certamen renovare parabat. At illum
 Alpharides fixa gladio petit ocus hasta,
 At medium clipei dempsit vasto impete partem,
 Hamatam rescans lorica atque ilia nudans,
 Labitur infelix Patavrid sua viscera cernens,
 Silvestrique ferae corpus, animam dedit Orco.

Many of the details of the fight betray the barbarous character of the age depicted. The slain are beheaded or fixed to the ground with a lance. At night the king and Hagano retire, prepared to renew the contest on the following day, from an ambushade. Waltharius fortifies his position as best he can, in order to be prepared for a night surprise, and shares the watch with his maiden companion. But first he gives attention to the dead ; and for the moment a Christian element, and perhaps a suggestion of chivalry already hinted at in the attitude of Waltharius towards Patavrid, enters into the poem :

Ad truncos sese convertit, amaro
 Cum gemitu, et cuicumque suum caput applicat, atque
 Contra orientalem prostratus corpore partem,
 Ac nudum retinens ense hac cum voce precatur :
 “ Rerum factori, sed in omnia facta regenti,
 Nil sine permissu cuius vel denique iussu
 Constat, ago gratias, qui me defendit iniquis
 Hostilis turmae telis, nec non quoque probris.
 Deprecor at Dominum contrita mente benignum,
 Ut qui peccantes non vult, sed perdere culpas,
 Hos in caelesti praestet mihi sede videri.”

In the morning, as they are threading the forest path, Hiltgunt perceives and warns her lover of an impending attack from the king and Hagano, whose fidelity to his lord will not permit him to see the latter return disgraced from the expedition. In the fight that ensues, all three of the combatants are wounded ; the king parts with one leg, Hagano with an eye, and Waltharius with his right hand. Finally the sadly mutilated warriors agree upon terms of peace, Hiltgunt brings wine, and the former enemies indulge in a grim contest of wit—“ hyperborean humor,” Carlyle would call it—over their cups that might elicit the “ Homeric

laughter" which Thoreau used to imagine as resounding from the bare rafters of the primeval palace :

*

Francus ait : " Iam dehinc cervos agitabis, amice,
 Quorum de corio wantis sine fine fruaris ;
 At dextrum moneo tenera lanugine comple,
 Ut causae ignaros palmae sub imagine fallas.
 Wah ! Sed quid dicis quod ritum infringere gentis,
 Ac dextro femori gladium agglomerare videris,
 Uxorique tuae, si quando ea cura subintrat,
 Perverso amplexu circumdabis euge sinistram ?
 Iam quid demoror ? En posthac tibi quicquid agendum est,
 Laeva manus faciet." Cui, Walthare, talia reddis :
 " Cur tam prosilias admiror, lusce Sicamber.
 Si venor cervos, carnem vitabis aprinam ;
 Ex hoc iam famulis tu suspectando iubebis,
 Heroum turba transversa tuendo salutans."

So we bid farewell to the battered warriors feasting under the greenwood tree, Waltharius and Hiltgunt reach their fatherland, are married, and for thrice ten years rule their people, happy in peace and successful in war.

Haec est Waltharii poesis. Nos salvet I H C.

says the poet in closing.

Of course *Waltharius* is one of the most Teutonic of mediaeval poems because it is practically a version of a German legend. From the mere point of Latinity—one that hardly does the poem justice—the literary interest is subservient to the linguistic ; for we do not, as in the *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis*, see Germanic influence dominating a piece that is intended to be classical. We expect the spirit of the *Waltharius* to be German in any case. What does interest us is to see the mobility with which the classical language adapts itself to the demands of a story, half saga, half romance, which is anything but classical in its conception and execution.

There are, naturally, classical influences apparent in the poem, but they seem to be confined to reminiscences from the *Aeneid*.* But the poet is by no means a slave to Vergilian expression. He had an excellent opportunity in the eleventh line of the poem to work in *Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos* ; a mere centonizer would have done so ; but there is hardly a suggestion of the line in *Foedera supplicibus donans sternensque rebelles*, so far as language is concerned. There are occasionally real centos. In our quotations we have

Iamque infra iactum teli congressus uterque
 Constiterat,

and we find in the *Aeneid*, xi, 608 :

* *Silvestrique ferae corpus, animam dedit Orco* is of course Homeric (II, A), probably derived indirectly through a late Latin version.

Greek as soon as the impulse of original authorship had spent itself. Even in pagan literature we have compilers like Gellius and epitomizers like Eutropius ingeniously employing the débris of former literary monuments in constructing and ornamenting their own less pretentious works. But this acknowledged and, to a certain extent, critical use of material conveniently at hand, merely suggests the beginning of a tendency that ended in the ninth and tenth centuries in almost complete literary parasitism so far, as a large portion of Latin writing was concerned. To be sure this does not include all that was written by any means, and many of the *catenae* were doubtless intended merely for convenient collections of experts. A few centuries later, in the hands of a man like Aquinas, such a compilation became really a contribution to literature. But in an earlier and less cultivated age these literary fungi often spread over and tried to conceal the prostrate trunks from which they derived their support and nourishment. They have thus sometimes done an involuntary service by preserving what they intended to destroy. Muratori, in his forty-third dissertation, gives several examples of this sort of literature in prose.

Though the *Troilus* does not belong to this last class of purely parasitical literature, in that the detail of plot and structure in the poem is to some extent original, so far as language is concerned it is practically a *catena* in verse. It shows what a man of wide reading and retentive memory could produce without drawing to any very great extent upon his stock of original expressions. The lines quoted are taken at random, and they are almost immediately preceded and followed by centos. The subject is the address of Agamemnon to the Greeks after the retreat to the ships :

Book III, vv. 99-112 :

Nulla dies adeo est pluvialibus obsita nimbis
 Non intermissis quod fluat imber aquis.
 Non Aurora diem sed laudat vespера, frustra
 Principium celebras, omnia fine legas.
 Causa iubet melior superos superare secundos ;
 Non habet eventus sordida praeda bonos.
 Troia modum teneas nodum tibi desinit hostis,
 Crastina sit nescis quid paritura dies.
 Omnia sunt hominum tenui pendentia filo,
 Multa levata diu cerno ruisse cito.
 Tu quoque fac timeas ; et quae modo tuta videntur,
 Dum loqueris, fieri tristia posse puta.
 Victorem victo succumbere saepe videmus,
 Saepe creat molles aspera spina rosas.

Besides an allusion to Horace or Lucan, the above lines contain the following centos from Ovid :

Nulla dies adeo est australibus humida nimbis
 Non intermissis ut fluat imber aquis.
 Pont. IV, 1-2.

Non habet eventus sordida praeda bonos.
Amores, I, 10, 48.

Omnia sunt hominum tenui pendencia filo,
Et subito casu quae valuere ruunt.
Pont. III, 35-36.

Tu quoque fac timeas; et quae tibi laeta videntur,
Dum loqueris, fieri tristia posse puta.
Pont. III, 57-58.

If we were to omit the last two lines, Ovid would furnish verbally or suggest more than half the quotation. This average would hardly hold good of the whole poem, and the sources drawn upon here are more limited than they are in other parts of the work. But the verses given are sufficient to show how the writer built up his mosaic; and after all, the ability to employ centos so felicitously is something nearly akin to artistic inspiration. The original verses, too, are sometimes not without their merit. The man who wrote such a work must have possessed not only a wide familiarity with classical writers, but also some appreciation of good poetry and, within mediaeval limitations, a cultivated taste. It is not difficult to imagine in Albertus a sort of monkish Gray.

The præmium to the *Troilus* contains a curious example of the petty cleverness which was rather a characteristic of the verse of this time, and is perhaps worth quoting for that reason. The writer says in reply to those who criticise his writing a heroic poem in elegiacs:

Sane concedo, sed gesta miserrima scribo,
Et strages miseras miserorum, qui misereri
Noluerant sibi nec aliis sed morte metebant
Se misera misere, misero stimulante furore.
Per miseros igitur elegos hoc ducere carmen.
Decrevi miserum, sortem miseratus eorum
De quibus hic legitur, miseri qui castra sequuntur.

While the *Troilus* and *Waltharius* are representative poems of the Middle Ages, and could have been written only at that time, they are not typical of mediaeval thought and feeling in every respect. Perhaps they approach too near to present-day standards of excellence for that. The rhymed lives of the Saints and the metrical chronicles were doubtless more in accordance with the taste and spirit of the times when they were written. We have in these two poems two opposite literary tendencies represented. In the earlier poem original inspiration is trying to break the mortmain of a dead language—a language dead or moribund in this sphere at least—and stretches its laws to their utmost limits; in the later the thought is facilely subservient to the phrase, and we have a sort of plaster cast, a replica of a classical production; one clasps hands with Beowulf and the *Nibelungenlied*, the other with the poetry of the Renaissance. The former is more akin in both time and spirit to the Carolingian revival, where we have the beginning of a vigorous, even though exotic, Latin-Teutonic literature, that might have attained some degree of vitality and importance in secular hands, but unfortunately took to celibacy and monastic life and lost itself in the sterility of the cloister.

The later poem reflects the spirit of the earlier, half romantic, half scholastic Renaissance, that preceded the Revival of Letters in Italy. These two poems, therefore, are representative not only of two opposite linguistic tendencies as manifested in mediaeval Latin literature, but also of two literary periods.

VI.

History is a form of literature always cultivated more or less, even among the most barbarous nations. In a rude age its expression is apt to be either poetical and the distinction between fact and fiction loosely drawn, or else it becomes a mere record of barren facts, standing in about the same relation to true history that an epitaph does to a biography. The earliest Germans seem to have favored the metrical form.* The sagas of the Northern, the ballads of the Celts, probably the "great number of verses" that the Druids taught to their acolytes,† were based upon historical traditions. Annals first come into existence with the introduction of letters. Their very baldness and brevity suggest the laborious, lapidary character of early writing.

In the Middle Ages the romances represented one phase of this literature, the monastic annals the other. The latter in some cases, especially where they deal with the local history of a convent or city, are about as crude from a linguistic and literary point of view as any writings that have been handed down from this period. On the other hand, there are works well enough written and extensive enough to deserve a place in true historical literature, had there been some manifestation of the critical faculty and appreciation of historical perspective on the part of their authors. As it is they are *origines*, sources of information about history, rather than monuments of historical literature itself. In fact the mediaeval chronicles represent all the varying styles from the driest of annals, mere records of reigns, wars, peaces, and pestilences, through real histories, like the History of the Lombards by Paulus Diaconus or Einhard's Life of Charles, memoirs or anecdotal histories like the St. Gall account of the exploits of Charlemagne *ex relationibus Adaelberti militis, qui Hunico, Saxicoque et Slavico Caroli bello interfuit*, to historical romances or pure prose romances, like the history of Geoffrey of Monmouth, or the story of Walter in the *Chronicon Novaliaciensis*.

Some of the very best prose of the Middle Ages is found in isolated passages of the more important chroniclers and historians. Einhard, the prose master of the Carolingian revival, wrote his life of Charles upon the model of Suetonius's life of Augustus; and though this imitative attitude may have led him to sacrifice originality to some extent, he attained a style that would not have done discredit in many respects to his Renaissance successors. An interesting comparison of the historical style of the early mediaeval and late mediaeval periods is afforded by the description of Britain from Bede and from Geoffrey of Monmouth. The value of the latter as an example of Latinity is considerably impaired by the fact that it is almost entirely a paraphrase of a similar chapter in Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae*. But then, the plagiarism is in a certain sense a characteristic thing. Bede's *Ec-*

* *Carminibus antiquis, quod unum apud illos memoriae et annalium genus est.* Tac. Germania, 2.

Magnum ibi numerum versuum ediscere dicuntur. Caes. B. G., VI, 14.

clesiastical History of the English was written in the first quarter of the eighth, and Geoffrey's *History of the Britons* in the first half of the twelfth century. The first, then, dates from before the Carolingian revival, the latter from the century preceding that which saw the birth of Dante.

Baeda, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, I, 1: Britannia, Oceani insula, cui quondam Albion nomen fuit, inter septentrionem et occasum locata est Germaniae, Galliae, Hispaniae, maximis Europae partibus multo intervallo ad-versa. Quae per milia passuum DCCC in Boream longa, latitudinis habet CC, exceptis dumtaxat prolixioribus diversorum promuntiorum tractibus,* quibus efficer ut circuitus eius quadrigies octies septuaginta quinque milia compleat. . . .

Opima frigibus atque orboribus insula, et alendis optime pecoribus ac iumentis;† vineas etiam quibusdam incolis germinans;‡ sed et avium ferax terra marique generis diversa. Fluviis quoque multum piscosis ac fontibus praeclara copiosis, et quidem praecipue issico abundat et arguilla.—Margaritas omnis quidem coloris inveniunt, id est et rubicundi et purpurei et iacinthini et prasini, sed maxime candidi.§—Quae etiam venis metallorum, aeris, ferri, et plumbi et argenti fecunda gignit et lapidem gagatem plurimum optimumque—est autem nigrogemma et ardens igni admotus—Et quia prope sub ipso septentrionali vertice mundi iacet, lucidas noctes habet; ita ut medio saepe tempore noctis in quaestionem venit intuentibus, utrum crepusculum adhuc permaneat vespertinum, an iam advenerit matutinum.||

Galfredus, *Historia Britonum*, I, 2: Britannia, insula optima, in occidentali Oceano inter Galliam est et Hiberniam sita; octingenta milia in longum, ducenta verum in latum continens, quicquid mortalium usui congruit indeficienti fertilitate ministrat. Omni enim genere metalli fecunda, campos late pansos habet collesque praepollenti culturae aptos, in quibus fruguum diversitates ubertate glebae temporibus suis proveniunt. Habet nemora universis ferarum generibus repleta, quorum in saltibus et in alternandis animalium pastibus gramina conveniunt, et advolantibus apibus flores diversorum colorum mella distribuunt. Habet prata sub aeris montibus amoeno situ virentia, in quibus fontes lucidissimi per nitidos rivos leni murmure manentes suaves sopores in ripis accubantibus irrigan. Porro lacubus atque piscosis fluviis irrigua est, et, praeter meridianae plagae fretum quo ad Gallias navigatur, tria nobilia flumina, Tamesis videlicet et Sabrinae, necnon et Humbrae, velut tria brachia extendit; quibus transmarina commercia ex universis nationibus eiusdem navigio feruntur.

The opening words and the expressions *metalli fecunda* and *piscosis fluviis* suggest Bede's account, while *fruguum diversitates ubertate glebae temporibus suis proveniunt* may have a very remote connection with Tacitus' *solum patiens fruguum—tarde mitescunt, cito proveniunt*. The portion of the third section of Gildas's *De Excidio Britanniae*, from which Geoffrey gets the suggestion for his account, reads as follows:

* *Exceptis diversorum prolixioribus promuntiorum tractibus*. Gildas, op. cit., sec. 3,

† *Pecorum magnus numerus*. Caes. B. G., V., 12.

‡ Since Roman times,—*Solum, praeter oleam vitemque—patiens frugum*. Tac. Agricola, 12.

§ *Gignit et Oceanus margarita sed subfusca ac liventia*, id., 12.

|| *Nox clara et in extrema Britanniae parte brevis, ut finem atque initium lucis exiguo discrimine internoscas*, id., 12.

"Campis quoque fulget late pansis collibusque amoeno situ locatis, praepolenti culturae aptis, montibusque alternandis animalium pastibus optime convenientibus, quorum diversorum colorum flores humanis gressibus pulsati non indecentem quondam ceu picturam eisdem imprimebant—electa veluti sponsa monilibus diversis ornata, fontibus lucidis, crebris undis niveas veluti glareas palantibus, pernitidis rivis leni murmure serpentibus, quorumque in ripis accubantibus suavis soporis pignus praetendentibus, et lacubus frigidum aquae torrentum vivae exundantibus, irrigua.—Absque meridiana freto plagae, quo ad Galliam Belgicam navigatur, vallata duorum ostiis nobilium Thamesis ac Sabrinae fluminum veluti brachiis, per quae eidem olim transmarinae deliciae vehebantur ratibus.

Though the quotations from Geoffrey and Gildas are very similar, there are traces of the schoolman in the later work. Such conceptions as *indeficienti fertilitate, fruguum diversitates, transmarina commercia* would have been expressed more concretely even at the time of Gildas. With the rise of scholasticism, historical writing assumed new *nuances* of style from the reaction of dialectic literature upon it. We feel at once the difference between the Latin of Einhard and his contemporaries, and that of Suger, the twelfth-century biographer of Louis the Fat. There is a tendency in the latter to favor abstracts and to introduce general for special conceptions, that we do not find in the earlier writers. Though the Latin was from one point of view more polished, in its very essence it had departed farther from classical ideals with the course of time. This is especially true of the Norman and French school of prose writers. In Italy it is chiefly legal Latin that influences the chroniclers of the three centuries preceding the Renaissance.* There is a popular vein occasionally visible in the historical writings of the North that relieves somewhat the abstractness and aridity of the Latin.

The imitation of antiquity was more unreservedly recognized as a means of forming style, however, in this branch of literature than in any other department of prose. This was natural. There were fewer ideas to be expressed in a narration involving principally secular history than in any other form of literature that could not be found in the Roman writers. To be sure military tactics and the methods of organizing men for warfare had changed. The theories of attack and defense, especially in the case of feudal strongholds, were totally different from those of the Romans. Political organization was also entirely different, and a host of new institutions and a wholly new officialdom had appeared; but the effect was not, like that introduced by a change of religion and philosophical conceptions, one that went down to the very vitals of the language which formed their medium of expression. The mediaeval political and social organization was as concrete as the classical, and it is only when we get into the realm of Church dogma as affecting secular affairs, and when ecclesiastical matters, miracles and anecdotes of saints and martyrs, become inextricably mingled with the narrative of profane events, as occasionally happens in Gregory of Tours, that we have anything like the same feeling of strangeness in looking over a mediaeval chronicle that we have when we first glance into a theological work or a scholastic treatise.

A language is usually modified when it is called upon to express a new class of conceptions. We have seen that this was true of Latin at the time of the intro-

* Centos from the Institutes and Digest are common in Italian works after the tenth century, cf. the *Rhetorimachia* of Anselm the Peripatetic, Thiemmier, o. c.

duction of Christianity into the Western Empire. Another linguistic creative period was occasioned by the rise of the universities and the elaboration of the scholastic philosophy after the Crusades. From the time of Benedict, Latin had been most at home in the monasteries; we now come to a time when the universities shared with these the function of protecting and cherishing the language of letters. But there was more positive, creative energy in the universities than in the cloisters. The latter had acted passively, had been the mother of letters, while the former disciplined them with paternal severity and trained them to usefulness in a new sphere of action. Scholastic Latin has contributed so much to both modern popular and technical language that, though many of its terms and constructions are without taste, are unnatural and artificial, though it is in some respects a sort of Frankenstein's monster of a language, its positive influence upon Latin was probably greater than its negative; it added more than it detracted; it increased the total potentiality of expression in that tongue; so that its contributions were available up to the time of Bacon and Spinoza. At the same time, by dividing the literary language into a popular and a learned dialect, the universities broke up the unity which had hitherto prevailed in Latin letters. The *Gesta Romanorum* and the songs of the Goliardi represent one phase; the later theological works and such treatises as the *De Monarchia* of Dante represent the opposite phase of the literature that followed.

Scholasticism, however, in the broad sense of the word, began much earlier than the mediæval schools. There is no absolute break between the Roman patristic and the scholastic literature. The later Church Fathers—if we confine the term to writers who flourished before the fall of Rome—were followed by the writers of compendia of universal knowledge, Cassiodorus, Isidorus and Bede. The human intellect was entering upon a chrysalis stage before the approaching frosts of the barbarian winter that was already at hand or threatening from the North. During the Middle Ages there was very little reception or assimilation from without. Knowledge kept feeding upon itself, digesting and redigesting, working over and casting into new forms the material that antiquity had collected. We express this activity by the term Scholasticism.

Still, it was impossible completely to exclude the influence of the Greek and Graeco-Semitic culture of the Byzantines and Saracens. There was a feeling hostile to Greek as being associated with schism, and to Arabic as being associated with Islamism; but at the point where the two areas of culture came into contact, as in Sicily and Spain, there was an inevitable stimulation of thought and intellectual activity from the antagonism and friction which the hostile systems developed, as well as from the contributions which each school of thought made to the other.

The influence of the Arabian learning was important more because it directed scholastic thought into new channels and to new sources of information, than on account of any original contributions to European knowledge. Even though more brilliant, the Saracenic culture did not have the same deep sources and organic connection with the whole social system that scholastic culture possessed. It did not take deep enough root to be perennial. There seems to have been a renaissance with every liberal minded ruler. In the time of the Calif Haken II., we are told, Andalusia became the great literary market of the world, to which the

products of every clime were carried. Books written in Syria and Persia were known there sooner than in the Orient. Haken had at Cairo, Bagdad, Damascus and Alexandria agents commissioned to procure for him at any price ancient or modern works of science. The catalogue of his library in itself comprised forty-four volumes, though it contained only the title of each book. His successor, however, chancing to be a religious fanatic, burned or threw into the palace cisterns all but the orthodox theological works. A similar though more interesting culture grew up at the court of Frederick II. in Sicily, and likewise was extinguished with its patron.

Greek, as has already been remarked, was regarded with suspicion as the language of heresy. As we see clearly from the glosses,* the Greek culture continued to wane in the schools and monasteries of Western Europe even after the Carolingian revival. The influence of the Irish schools soon spent itself. Scotus Erigena wrote Greek verses,† was thoroughly familiar with the Greek Fathers, and made hasty translations from Greek into Latin, as in case of the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita.‡ His literary history is perhaps the best testimony we have of the high standing of the Irish schools at the opening of the ninth century. On the other hand, Aquinas, four hundred years later, who represented the culmination of the movement begun by Scotus, did not know Greek, but obtained his translation of Aristotle from a Flemish monk.§ During this period a ready knowledge of Greek was probably about as rare in Western Europe as a knowledge of Egyptian hieroglyphics is to-day. We must except southern Italy and Sicily from this statement. Even now the peasants of some of the remote villages of Sicily and Calabria speak a dialect of Greek.|| It certainly was a spoken language in a considerable part of Italy up to the opening of the Renaissance. The archives of Naples show its official use up to the time of the Norman conquest of that country. At Nardo and Otranto Greek schools flourished as late as the sixteenth century.¶

But though Greek culture itself was on the wane, it is the introduction of Greek thought that marks the most important epoch in the history of scholasticism. Before Aristotle became the master of the schools, scholastic theology had been largely ethical and exegetical; after that time it was largely speculative and metaphysical. This latter period is marked by the dialectical refinement of the language. There is not the faintest reminiscence of Cicero's sonorous sentences in the shrill jargon of the controversialist. The most practical and concrete of all tongues becomes the medium for expressing the most refined of metaphysical subtleties. Probably at no time in its existence had Latin been so far away from home as at this period. That it should have survived in the attenuated ether of the disputation hall is most emphatic evidence of its hardy constitution. In all its previous Protean metamorphoses we see some suggestion of a faculty developed in its previous history. Even the rude chronicle suggests the early *Annales*; the hymns and street songs suggest the popular rhythms of the nursery or of the triumph;

* Thurot, op. cit., pp. 66-7; 108-9.

† Some are found in P. L. CXXII, pp. 1238 et seq. : also M. G. H. p. m. a., iii, 2, 2.

‡ Kaulich, op. cit., p. 68; P. L. CXXII.

§ Geugueray, op. cit., 18.

|| Gebhardt, op. cit., 137.

¶ Muratori, Sc. II.

Christian theological literature before this time had retained some hint of the early Fathers and through them of Seneca and Cicero. Even the most ignorant of the monks, stammering a loose story over the last cup of a refectory banquet finds some analogy in the drunken freedman at the *cena* of Trimalchio. But the dialectician was an entirely new type, and he was conscious of the fact. He frankly cut loose from Donatus and Priscian and sailed off into a linguistic world of his own. Of course, men like Aquinas wrote correct Latin, Latin that was from a scholastic point of view excellent, and is perfectly intelligible to one familiar with the technical meaning of its vocabulary. Scholastic Latin performed its part as well as classical Latin had, a thousand years before. Perhaps to a man brought up to use it from infancy it was a beautiful language, exciting the same æsthetic pleasure that a neat application of Taylor's formula excites in the heart of a mathematician. It had no color, no perspective, and not much form; but it was as perfect as compass and T-square could make it. This quality is illustrated in a representative sentence like the following: *Illi qui sunt simpliciter inaequales, si non recipiunt secundum illam inaequalitatem, iniustum fit simpliciter eis; sed virtuosī sunt simpliciter inaequales respectu aliorum, ipsos excedentes secundum virtutem; ergo si non recipiunt secundum illam inaequalitatem, iniustum fit eis.* Another sentence, this time not from Aquinas, shows how modern the word order is as a rule: *Intentio nostra in hac distinctione est quod praebeamus omnes vias claras et demonstrationes firmas quae faciunt scire quaestionem magnam, etc.* Naturally, when language becomes a sort of a formula, without shading or coloring, or the thousand and one *nuances* that go to make up style, the linguistic sense becomes weak, and it is easy to insert, without any feeling of incongruity, whatever term chances to stand in the mind of the writer as the symbol of an idea, without any regard to its source or ancestry. The following quotation perhaps caricatures this tendency somewhat; but that it was possible at all in serious literature proves how little appreciation for linguistic propriety the mediaeval philosophers sometimes had. It is taken from a translation of one of the Arabic writers, probably the Spanish Saracen Averroës: *Invarikin terra alkanarnihy, stediei et baraki et castrum munitum destendedyn descenderunt adenkirati ubi descendit super eos aqua Euphratis veniens de Eutein.* No wonder that Bacon considered the Arabic philosopher *male translatus*. He attributes the introduction of foreign words to the fact that Latin did not have terms for expressing all the new ideas that were being introduced with the Arabic philosophy.*

The Paris schoolmen, however, remedied this defect, and in so doing conferred a benefit upon subsequent thought and literature that is not always recognized. For while the importance of scholastic philosophy as a training school for mental discipline, and thus as a progymnasia of modern culture, is generally admitted, the value of its contributions to the lexicography of science and even of common life is often overlooked. Though the sphere of its speculations was confined largely to grammar, logic, theology and metaphysics, the terms that it created have entered

*Opus Magnum, pp. 45-6; De Grammatica: *Interpres non habuerunt vocabula in Latino pro scientiis transferendis, quia non fuerunt primo compositae in lingua Latina; et propter hoc posuerunt infinita de linguis alienis.—Quae sicut multa alia prius ab Hispanis scholaribus derisus cum non intelligebam quod legebam, ipsis vocabula maternae linguae scientibus, tandem didici ab eisdem.*

modern life with a much wider application than the fact might indicate. The schoolmen sought for, and the best of them attained almost absolute precision of language. This of course involved principally an extension and modification of the vocabulary and did not affect syntax. The examples of scholastic Latin already given are sufficient to show that this latter remained practically what it had been throughout the Middle Ages.

Parts of words that had been lost in classical Latin were brought back into use. In this way the present participle of *esse* (*ens*) was restored to the language. Words that were rare enough to be somewhat plastic in previous Latin, and that were etymologically suitable, were seized upon and received a fixed and definite technical signification. So *abstractio*, which first occurs in the later writer Dictys Cretensis, received its familiar modern meanings from the mediaeval schools; in the original sense of taking away, *per abstractionem albedinis prius commixtae* (Phys., I, 9); in the metaphysical sense, *cum dicitur universale abstractum, duo intelliguntur, scilicet ipsa natura rei, et abstractio seu universalitas* (Sum. Theol., I., 85, 2, 2); in the sense suggested by our "fit of abstraction," *prophetiae inspiratio quandoque fit cum abstractione a sensibus* (De Ver., xii., 9, c). Similarly *actualis*, which is found only in the *Somnium Scipionis* in Roman Latin, has not only its original meaning of acting, active, but also the sense represented in English by actual, real as opposed to possible, *formae—sunt magis actuales* (De Potentia, vi., 3, 2). *Apprehensio*, our apprehension in a psychological sense, first appears with an abstract meaning in a medical work of the fifth century. Its adoption was doubtless facilitated by the existence of *comprehensio*, which had been coined by Cicero. From these were formed *apprehensivus* and *comprehensivus*—valuable words in English—where the distinction between the root words is still maintained, *intellectus—universalium apprehensivus* (Contra Gentiles, 2, 48); *essentia—comprehensiva omnium* (Sum. Theol., I., 84). Words common in classical Latin with a concrete signification received an abstract meaning at the hands of the schoolmen. For instance *conceptio* has for this reason given us conception in its abstract senses, and *conceptus* has given us concept. *Conclusio* is an instance of a word apparently coined in the middle ages. *Essentia* lost its *duritas*, and *entitas*, despite its hybrid character, thrived and has survived from that period. As Greek was little understood by the schoolmen, especially those of the classical age of scholasticism, their vocabulary was based almost entirely upon Latin, and this language in a certain sense made good what it had lost through the neglect that it had suffered at the time of the early Fathers. It is possible that *aristocratia* and *aristocraticus*, *diaphanus* and *diaphaneitas* and a few words that have not survived in modern tongues entered Latin at this time.

Many new derivatives were formed. As an example, we find in Aquinas *potentia*, *potentialis*, *potentialitas*, and *potentialiter*, of which only the first is found in classical Latin and the last in late Latin. To the schoolmen we owe such common words as improbability (*improbabilitas*), irregularity (*irregularitas*), personality (*personalitas*), and (with modified meaning) predicament (*praedicamentum*), subsistence (*subsistentia*), and many adjectives like figurative (*figurativus*), and visual (*visualis*). In fact, it is probable that by far the greater portion of the words coined by the schoolmen and employed by their best writers have been received into English and have become part of our common speech. An incomplete list of

the words beginning with *a* found in the writings of Aquinas alone, that, besides being in most cases of mediæval formation, have entered English with meanings either given or suggested by the schoolmen would include the following : *abstracte, abstractio, acceptatio, accidentalis, accidentaliter, actualis, actualitas, actualiter, adaequatus, æquivalentia, antecedentes, applicatio, apprehensivus, appropriate, approximatio, argumentativus.*

Later we shall have occasion to note the peculiar attitude which the scholastic grammarians assumed toward their classical predecessors. It is sufficient here to remark that there was the same spirit of innovation abroad that we find manifesting itself in the vocabulary. Latin was no longer crumbling to pieces in the hands of neglect, but it was being rebuilt and made habitable, so far as possible, by the rude skill of the mediæval artisan. The classical restoration was yet to come.

VIII.

Whenever Latin was employed in writings intended for a wide constituency, it was natural to introduce into the language popular idioms and expressions, and to make it in every way as intelligible as possible for those whose scholarship and mental training was not extensive enough to permit of their following with ease the involved sentences and the technical and abstract phraseology of more pretentious works. With the growth of the universities and the concentration in single towns of thousands of students of various nationalities, imbued all of them with a smattering at least of Latin and making that speech their chief medium of communication from necessity in daily life and from choice in the lecture room and disputation hall, there grew up spontaneously a sort of a *lingua franca* Latin that approximated in many of its forms very nearly to the vulgar tongues. A Bologna jurist uses such an idiom when he says : *Scholares non sunt boni pagatores. Scire volunt omnes, mercedem solvere nemo.* It does not involve any very great strain upon our credulity to imagine the ten thousand students of Bologna able to converse more or less fluently in such a tongue as this. Every parish hamlet, every one of the innumerable religious houses, every town and city, contained their tens or scores or thousands who employed this speech with the unconscious facility of a mother tongue. This language of the mediæval schools does not exist in literary monuments and is, like the *sermo plebeius* of the Romans, practically a lost speech. We do not know how it was pronounced, if there was any common usage in the matter, and the popular Latin that was written was always affected more or less by the sort of classical cant that pervades the Goliard poetry. It does not contain the slang, the barrack room phrases, the colloquial turns that always grow up in a language which is used conversationally. We merely know that this school language probably varied from more or less pure Latin, through those combinations of Latin and the vulgar tongues that we find in some of the Goliard songs, to the dog Latin, or Latinized vernacular that Rabelais ridicules in the Paris scholars.

Popular works written in Latin still retained the semblance of literary form and finish. Some of them are quite as excellent in their way as more labored productions. The author sometimes expressly states that he has adopted a style intended to be understood easily by his readers. So Geoffrey of Monmouth, in

the introduction to his chronicle, says: *Agresti stylo propriisque calamis contentus*. Remember that he borrows half of an immediately succeeding chapter from Gildas: *nam si ampullosis dictionibus paginam illervissem, taedium legentibus ingererem, dum magis in exponendis verbis quam in historia intellegenda ipsos commorari oporteret*.

It has always been noted that the Church hymns probably derived their rhythmical form from the popular poetry of the Romans. The reverse of these is seen in the popular songs of the vagabond students of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Goliardi, as they were called from their mythical patrons or chief Goliath—the gourmand—belonged to the clerical order, but seem to have represented the unschooled, undisciplined, vagrant geniuses whom the overcrowded mediaeval schools threw into the world with little other heritage than a smattering of literary training, irregular habits, and that careless or satirical attitude toward the serious problems of life that characterizes the devotees to *la vie de Bohême*. They parodied the hymns of the Church in their drinking songs, celebrated mass to Bacchus, and used sacred metres to sing the praises of their mistresses. Still these poems are not without their merit. Sometimes a delicate sentiment is found expressed in almost perfect verse. The influence of provincial poetry is not entirely absent. Spring and love form the theme of many a stanza that has an echo of the troubadours in it.

Sometimes also a serious vein runs through a poem, oftener the bitter gall of satire. Piers Ploughman and Colin Clout have their archetypes in the

Goliardois,
A gloton of wordes,
And to the aungel on heigh
Answerde after :
“ Dum rex regere
Dicatur nomen habere
Nomen habet sine re,
Nisi studet iura tenere.”*

The tendency of the mediaeval universities to make a specialty of some one particular faculty favored an itinerant life on the part of the students. As one monkish writer puts it: *Urbes et orbem circuire solent scholastici, ut ex multis litteris efficiantur insani. Ecce quaerunt clerici Parisii artes liberales, Aureliani auctores, Bononiae codices, Salerni pyxides, Toleti daemones, et nusquam mores*. Their clerical privileges distinguished them from the common vagabonds, the jugglers and strolling players, the pilgrims, saunterers, and mendicants that thronged the mediaeval highways. This point of privilege and superior caste was one upon which they were apt to insist strongly. Their attitude toward laymen in general was a hostile or contemptuous one:

Aestimetur autem laicus ut brutus,
Nam ad artes surdus est et mutus.
Laici non sapiunt
Ea quae sunt vatis.†

* Piers Ploughman, v. 277, et seq.

* Burana, 124.

† Bur., p. 74.

The Goliards lack the distinctive feature of the Renaissance—individuality. They are a class; their poems are choruses rather than solos. Like our college songs, or negro melodies, or coster songs, the verses of the Goliardi are literary foundlings. Though lyrical in form they lack the essential element of lyrical poetry—personality. We see through them not the author, but the whole homeless, itinerant *quart état* of the ecclesiastical world. We have seen before that the sense of literary property was not strongly developed during the Middle Ages. Dependence upon classical models was not favorable to abstinence from plagiarism. One of the Goliard songs borrows phrases and verses freely from another, and all underwent numerous modifications in their oral transmissions from singer to singer and cloister to cloister. Their unacknowledged or forgotten literary paternity doubtless favored this. Though the class for which he wrote formed but a small minority in any particular region, the reading public of a mediæval Latin author was not confined by national boundaries, but was scattered all over Western Europe. This led to the diffusion of popular Latin literature over a large area, and, consequently, especially under the conditions then prevailing, to a divergence of form through the infusion of local color.

In connection with this we might remark *obiter* that one of the things which most surprises a person studying the literary history of this time is to see with what rapidity a popular book was disseminated throughout Europe after its publication. No doubt this diffusion of literature was facilitated by the fact that much of it was in a common language. But even the songs of the troubadours were soon translated into German and the Scandinavian and Slavonic dialects as well as into Spanish and Italian. Speaking of the East, Renan says that when intercourse with the Levant was active, a book published at Cairo was known at Paris or Cologne sooner than the average German book is known in France to-day.* The Jews seem to have been active intermediaries in this work. On the other hand we have instances where a Latin author takes his book and travels all over Western Europe, introducing it into schools and universities. Like Goldsmith, he pays his way by holding disputations, or depends upon the charity of the monks. Anselm the Peripatetic thus took his *Rhetorimachia* presumably from Milan, where it was composed, to Piacenza, Lucca, the cloister of San Benigno, Bâle, Augsburg, Bamberg, and Mayence.† Wippo seems to have done the same.‡ The Vergil legends diffused themselves from Naples all over Western Europe within a few years from the time when they first attracted the notice of writers. From the opening of the Crusades the scholars and literati of Roman Christendom seem to have taken to a wandering life, and to have peddled their wares from province to province like the bards of old. Popular songs and legends came into the possession of street singers, who migrated like the birds; and a single season could diffuse them over Europe.

Classical figures and allusions are frequent in Goliard poetry. This is a feature that distinguishes it from the poetry of the troubadours. Antithetical tendencies are seen in the literature of the Romance and the Latin tongues. In the former, even classical heroes and institutions become mediæval. Alexander is a knight, Troy

* Op. cit., p. 202.

† Dummler, op. cit., p. 9.

‡ Stenzel, *Gesch. Deutschlands*, II., 47.

a feudal stronghold. In the latter, the pagan gods and goddesses still reign, Venus and Bacchus inspire song, Jupiter watches over the affairs of men :

Homo videt faciem, sed cor patet Iovi.

Love, wine and satire form the usual themes of the Goliard. Among songs of the first class are some that have a purely classical suggestion, such as cxlix. and those immediately following in the *Burana* collection.* The love of Aeneas and Dido or of Paris and Helen is oftenest celebrated. The conversation of Dido and Anna, in the fourth book of the Aeneid, is thus rendered by the mediaeval lyricist :

Anna, dux,
Mea lux,
Iste quis sit ambigo ;
Quis honor,
Quis color,
Vultu quis intelligo ;
Ut reor,
Ut vereor,
Hunc nostra connubia
Poscere,
Id vere
Portendunt mea somnia.†

The romantic influence is stronger in poems relating to spring, and especially to spring conceived of as the time when the poet's wayward fancy lightly turns to thoughts of vernal love :

Salve ver optatum,
Amantibus gratum,
Gaudiorum
Fax multorum,
Florum incrementum,

sings one ; another begins with,

Floret tellus floribus
Variis coloribus,
Floret et cum gramine.
Vacent iam amoribus
Iuvenes cum moribus
Vario solamine ;

while a second and a third express a similar sentiment with the following :‡

Ecce gratum
Et optatum
Ver reducit gaudia ;

* *Carmina Burana*, pp. 56 et seq.

† *Burana*, p. 155.

‡ Du Méril, *Poésies populaires Latines antérieures au XII^e Siècle*, p. 379.

Purpuratum
 Floret pratum,
 Sol serenat omnia;
 Iam cedat tristitia,
 Aestas redit,
 Nunc recedit
 Hiemis saevitia ;

and,

Florent omnes arbores,
 Dulce canunt volucres,
 Revirescunt frutices,
 Congaudete iuvenes ;

Such poetry evidently has much less of the classical element in it than the *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis* ; but in a way it is less Teutonic. It breathes the softer passion of the South. However, the form of a disputation appears again in *De Phyllide et Flora*. The two maidens discuss the merits of their respective lovers, one a soldier, the other a cleric. Of course the court of love—here a *curia*—decides in favor of the latter ;

Ad amorem clericum
 Dicunt aptiorem.

Another example of the disputation appears in the *Conflictus Ovis et Lini*, where the theme is evident from the title. Others of a similar character—for instance, between the heart and the eye, and a very popular one between water and wine—are found in the English collection of Goliard poems ascribed to Walter Mapes. It is worth nothing, perhaps, that the disputation and the satire form a much more important part of this English than they do of the Continental collections, a fact indicative possibly of national taste, if not of authorship.

The best known of the drinking songs is the one beginning :

Meum est propositum
 In taberna mori ;
 Vinum sit appositum
 Morientis ori,
 Ut dicant cum venerint
 Angelorum chori :
 “Deus sit propitius
 Isti potatori.”

This is really modified from stanzas of a poem which has been thought so representative of the Goliardi as a class as to receive the title *Confessio Poetae*, the general confession of the whole order. Perhaps this is the best secular Latin rhyme ever written ; certainly in naïve, witty frankness it equals anything that we possess in that language, whether classical or modern.* The poem contains a personal element. Its author was led to address it to his patron, *Electe Coloniae*, to defend himself against the scandal that his loose life had occasioned, and to prom-

* Burana, p. 67 ; Mapes, p. 71 ; Notices des Manuscrits, Tome 29, p. 266.

ise reform in the future. It was written between 1162 and 1165, at Pavia, and marks the culmination of the Goliard period. Most of the songs of this character, however, probably originated in Northern France. The fact that this one was written in Italy was accidental, and proves nothing as to the nationality of the author.

In bitterness of spirit the poet confesses his own instability of character. He is blown hither and thither like a leaf in the wind ;

Cum sit enim proprium
Viro sapienti
Supra petram ponere
Sedem fundamenti,
Stultus ego comparor
Fluvio labenti,
Sub eodem tramite
Nunquam permanenti.

He is like a ship without a pilot, or a bird borne on in aimless flight. Serious thoughts and occupations do not attract him ;

Mihi cordis gravitas
Res videtur gravis ;
Iocus est amabilis
Dulciorque favis.

Then follows an account of the three things that have done most to estrange him from a life of probity ;

Res est arduissima
Vincere naturam,
In aspectu virginis
Mentem esse puram ;
Iuvenes non possumus
Legem sequi duram,
Iuvenumque corporum
Non habere curam.

Play also has its charms for him, but when he leaves it, stripped of all his possessions, he writes better verses than when sluggish with prosperity. Last of all comes the tavern ;

Tertio capitulo
Memoro tabernam,
Illam nullo tempore
Sprevi neque spernam.

He does not sympathize with those studious, solitary poets who,

ut opus faciant
Quod non possit mori,
Moriuntur studio
Subditi labori,

His inspiration comes from a different source ;

Tales versus facio
 Quale vinum bibo ;
 Nihil possum facere
 Nisi sumpto cibo ;
 Nihil valet penitus
 Quae ieiunus scribo,
 Nasonem post calicem
 Carmine praeibo.

Finally, however, comes a promise to lead a better life in the future, the doubtful sincerity of which does not affect in the least our lenient disposition toward the penitent :

Iam virtutes diligo,
 Vititis irascor,
 Renovatus animo
 Spiritu renascor ;
 Quasi modo genitus
 Lacte novo pascor,
 Ne sit meum amplius
 Vanitatis vas cor.

The poem has been translated into English by Leigh Hunt; and an older version, entitled *The Jovial Priest's Confession*, is found in Camden's *Remains*. We have here another phase of those sharp contrasts and picturesque antitheses that characterized mediaeval society ; feudal chiefs in narrow castles, and knight errants tasting the pleasures and hardships of every clime ; serfs bound to the soil, and pilgrims and vagabonds making the whole world their home ; monks passing the monotonous round of life in narrow cloister gardens, and strolling students whose curriculum—in the original sense of the word—embraced Salerno, Oxford and Salamanca ; ascetics and hermits incarnating abstinence and self-denial, and roving, jolly priests, whose appetite for the pleasures of life knew no satiety. Because the clerical order embraced all literary men it necessarily included the incipient Marlowes and Congreves of mediaeval literature. These men belonged to the Middle Ages ; but it needed only one more metamorphosis in mental evolution to make them humanists.

Other of the Goliard songs have a serious purpose. The reforming spirit that animated the Church, or at least the lesser clergy at this period found expression in these verses of the highways and byways. The distinctively popular character of this poetry, within the liberal limits which its language set, cannot be over-estimated. *Ad plateas descendamus* might have been its motto. All the spirit of revolt against corruption in high places, whether it were in court or curia, was centered in it. Strangely out of harmony with the general character of their poetry as it may appear, this consciousness of a moral mission was frequently expressed by the Goliards

Reprobare reprobos
 Et probos probare,

Et probos ab improbis
Veni segregare,

writes one.* There is something of Skelton in the following† :

In huius mundi patria
Regnat idolatria,
Ubique sunt venalia
Dona spiritualia.
Custodi sunt raptores
Et lupi praedatores.
Principes et reges
Subverterunt leges.

Cardinales, ut praedixi,
Novo iure crucifixi
Vendunt patrimonium.
Petrus foris, intus Nero,
Intus lupus, foris vero
Sicut agni ovium.

The following is quoted from a poem which begins,

Utar contra vitia
Carminibus rebelli,

and is one of the bitterest :

Roma capit singulos
Et res singulorum,
Romanorum curia
Non est nisi forum.

Papa, si rem tangimus,
Nomen habet a re,
Quicquid habent alii
Solus vult papare.

The period of the Goliards passed. The order became degenerate and was suppressed by a series of decrees issued by the ecclesiastical councils and courts. Some of the strollers took refuge in the laity, and a number of songs remain, half Latin, half vulgar, as reminiscences of this transition period.† Many of the poems, however, survived in their original form in the cloisters, while others continued popular at the universities and thus became the progenitors of modern college songs ‡

Turning to the prose side of popular Latin we find a representative compilation, taking about the same place in this department of literature that the *Burana* col-

* *Burana*, pp. 14 and 18.

† Of the satirical poems besides those in the *Burana* many are published by Du Ménil, *Poésies Populaires*, pp. 155-87; *Poésies inédites*, pp. 313-354; *Poésies Populaires ant. au XI^eme S.*, 231 (cf. note). Many are also found in *Mapes* as already indicated.

‡ *Gaudefamus Igitur* seems to have been from this source; cf. Hubatsch, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

lection does in that of poetry, in the *Gesta Romanorum*. In order to hold the attention of his untutored and often illiterate audience, the mediaeval preacher found it necessary to mingle with his exhortations and homilies, stories and popular illustrations from romance and profane history. In this way a rather hazy and superficial familiarity with the names of some of the classical authors and with phrases from their works was spread among the people. They knew of them, so to speak, through hearsay evidence. The priest was doubtless often as ignorant as his parishioners of the antecedents of the tale or the historical environment of the events that he related for their edification. Of course these fables were rendered into the vernacular and received their moral interpretation from the individual priests, but they passed from hand to hand within sacerdotal circles in vulgar Latin. Gradually they assumed a conventional form, stereotyped "morals" were annexed, and they were gathered into collections convenient for practical use, such as the one already mentioned.

This compilation of nearly three hundred tales with their accompanying "morals" was probably the work of an English author, and dates from about the close of the thirteenth century. The work was very popular and has been translated and published in various editions, both vernacular and Latin, so that the character of the latter, which is contemporary with the beginning of the Renaissance, has doubtless been somewhat modified. The tales, however, had a much earlier origin than the work. We find them drifting about, in prose or verse, through all the Middle Age literature, and they appear later in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, Poggio's *Facetiae*, and in scores of writers who employed their plots with more or less modification in subsequent works. Erasmus alludes to the *Gesta* when he is ridiculing the theologians in the *Encomium Moriae*. These considered it evidence of highest skill to be able to drag out some foolish and vulgar tale from one of these compilations and interpret it allegorically, tropologically, and anagogically.* In fact at this time the pagan writers also—and it seems that Ovid was a favorite in this respect—were interpreted at the universities with especial reference to their supposed mystical or allegorical meaning.

Many of the stories in the *Gesta* were not at all such as one would expect to hear repeated in a pulpit of a Sunday morning nowadays. The following, however, will serve to illustrate the Latin without being offensive to one's sense of delicacy.

Refert Augustinus in *De Civitate Dei*, quod Dyonides pirata galea una longo tempore in mari homines spoliavit et cepit. Qui cum multis navibus iussu Alexandri fuisset quesitus et tandem captus, et Alexander presentatus eum interrogavit dicens: Quare mare habet te infestum? Ille statim respondit: Quare te orbis terrarum? Sed quia ego hoc ago una galea, latro vocor; tu vero mundum opprimens navium multitidine magna diceris imperator. Sed si circa me fortuna mansuesceret, fierim melior; e converso, tu quanto infortunior tanto deterior. Alexander respondit: Fortunam tibi mutabo, ne malicia tue fortune, sed meritis ascribatur. Sicque ditatus est per eum ut de latrone factus est princeps et zelator iusticie.

* *Superest iam quintus actus, in quo summum artificem præstare convenit. His mihi stultam aliquam et indictam fabulam ex Speculo opinor Historiali aut Gestis Romanorum in medium adferunt, et eandem interpretantur allegorice, tropologicæ, et anagogice.* Op. Om., Tomus IV., 478, A.

Carissimi, latro in mari cum una galea est peccator in mundo cum sola vita, et tamen non desistit occidere virtutes et spoliare per peccatum quas recepit in baptismo. Sed Alexander, *i. e.* princeps vel prelatus, habet talem ad viam rectitudinis adducere per naves, *i. e.* per monita sancte ecclesie, etc.

This popular, barbarous Latin continued to be written and spoken long after the Revival of Learning, not in a sporadic and accidental way—like our college salutations—but forming the great bulk probably of what was spoken and written professionally in the schools and universities and monasteries, especially north of the Alps, during these centuries. An interesting and instructive caricature of this *sermo plebeius* of the Renaissance and Reformation period—the *barbaries* of Erasmus and his contemporaries—is the Latin of the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, an anonymous pasquinade directed against the monks, more particularly those of Cologne, at the time of the Reuchlin controversy.

The Letters inveigh against the same abuses that Erasmus ridicules, but in a manner so broad and coarse as to give offense even to the Bâle wit himself. Their authorship was long in dispute. Some even ascribed them to Erasmus at the time, but it is probable that they were principally the work of Ulrich von Hutten, who represented the most radical element of the reforming party.* They would have fallen flat had the vices and ignorance they depicted not existed, and their Latin would have been meaningless had it not, like Josh Billings's or Nasby's English, contained a germ of realism that gave substance and meaning to the caricature.

The theme of this fictitious correspondence of *obscuri viri*—monks, theologians and university men—was the gossip and controversies of the cloisters and some of the every-day incidents that were supposed to form the undercurrent of university and monastery life. The fact that they are full of human interest and really entertaining and amusing to-day, testifies to a spark of genius in the men who wrote them, and partially explains their great popularity at the time of publication. As we are not concerned with the theological side of the satire, the following extract from an epistle, dealing with more general subjects, will best serve to illustrate the character of the work, and in an approximate way the popular Latin of the Early Reformation period: *Superexcellens necnon scientificissimus vir dominus Ortvinus Gratius Daventriensis, poeta, orator, et philosophus, necnon theologicus* figures prominently in the correspondence as the patron and literary father of the younger letter-writers. It is to him that a young *baccalaureus* addresses the following:

Salutem cum humilitate erga vestram maioritatem. Venerabilis domine magister:—Venit huc unus socius qui portavit certa carmina, et dixit quod vos composuistis illa. Tunc unus poeta hic qui habet magnam laudem sed non est bene Christianus vidit illa et dixit quod non sunt bona, et quod habent multa vitia. Et ego dixi: *Si magister Ortvinus composuit, tunc non habent vitia. Hoc est certum.* Et volui impignorare tunicam meam quod si illa metra haberent vitia, tunc vos non composuistis; sed si vos composuissetis, tunc non haberent vitia.

Before approaching the Latinity of the Renaissance, it may be worth our while to take one glance back over the mediaeval history of Latin, in order to see what elements it contains that help to explain the character of the revival that followed.

*Three authors were associated in the work, Hutten being the principal one.

In doing this we may have to pass for a moment beyond the discussion of merely literary facts to the consideration of the social and political conditions which lie beneath them. In the previous pages we have seen that from its period of culmination under Augustus, Latin gradually waned to almost total occultation in the seventh and eighth centuries. A mere glimmer of light, a memory of past radiance, survived in the Lombard cities and the Irish cloisters. Then succeeded a period of waxing, beginning with the time of Charlemagne, that finally resulted in the brilliant classical revival of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is customary, upon a superficial view, to look upon Latin as a language that died sometime between the age of Tacitus and Justinian, but whose galvanized corpse continued to stalk the earth in a halting way for a decade of centuries later. From this point of view, subsequent Latin literature would be a purely artificial phenomenon. But there are no artificial phenomena in history. No one would have been more surprised than the mediæval clerk or the humanist at such a view of Latin. For them that language had had a continuous existence from the time when its accents first were heard in the Forum and the Senate House. They looked forward to its continuing the great immutable literary language of the future. Without this belief and this faith the revival of classical letters would have been impossible in the form in which it did occur. Under the conditions which existed that revival was a necessary step in the evolution of European culture. It was the inevitable result of past forces and events, and as such as important, as pregnant a fact in its way as any other literary period.

Though we have but the unsubstantial basis of a speculation for the statement, it is probable that had Italy, through some political or physical convulsion, ceased to exist as a factor in European history, the Renaissance, as we understand that word, would never have occurred. France was without doubt intellectually the most precocious of modern European nations. In the Scholastic Latinity of the Paris University or the Romance Latinity of the Goliardi we possibly have something approximating to the ultimate form that Latin letters would have assumed before being supplanted by a native literature, had an indigenous culture, unaffected by transmontane influences, prevailed. Italy became the dominant force in directing European culture because of her vast heritage from antiquity, a heritage of sentiment as well as of culture, of feeling as well as of intellect. Classical culture had been latent, not extinguished, in Italy. And beneath this was the other, more important factor. Classical ideas were the ideals of the people, not of a class. The revival of ancient letters grew up in Italy; it would have had to grow down in any other country.

This does not necessarily imply that literary culture was more general in Italy than in the other lands of Europe, though, as we shall see, this was to a certain extent the case. It was inspired by different conceptions and ideas here than elsewhere. We cannot presume to attempt, nor have we the space for, a comprehensive discussion of this subject. We can only illustrate the fact by a reference to what were perhaps the two most important legacies that antiquity left peculiarly to Italy. One was the conception of the political continuity of the Roman nation; the other was the continuance of a distinctively secular as distinguished from a clerical culture.

A mere casual glance at Italian history during the Middle Ages does not reveal

any very essential differences between the political and social condition of that country and that of the countries north of the Alps. The landscape presents the same succession of feudal castles and walled towns, of noble hunting preserves and serf-tilled fields. But if instead of viewing these things from the long range of history, we could have actually been present, it is probable that we should have been able to discover under all this something that distinguished Italy from contemporary France or Germany. The feudal noble, instead of being illiterate, had learned the rudiments of ancient lore in the neighboring municipality, where remains of civic life had persisted from the time of the Republic. He regards the Church as a political quite as much as a religious institution. His own and the neighboring estates bear testimony in ruins and legends to the ancient enlightenment and power and glory of a race that he regards his own. The Scipios and Catos are, in the vague sphere of his historical imagination, as real and present to him as King Alfred is to the average Englishman to-day. He shares these feelings and sentiments with the merchant aristocracy of the towns. He still regards transalpine strangers as barbarians. Yet his conception of the political continuity of Rome is not the clear, definite conception of the publicist, a Holy Roman Empire. It is indefinite, because he has only a vague, hazy idea of what Rome really was. It is a sentiment rather than a theory. Now it is the Republic, now the Empire that appeals most strongly to his imagination; or more often still he does not distinguish between the two. When this sentiment seeks to find definite expression in acts, as in case of Rienzi, inconsistencies and contradictions appear, an odd medley of bizarre conceptions, that make the political realization of this ideal evidently a pathetic, congenital impossibility. But its effectiveness as a source of literary inspiration is not hampered in the least by this. Rather it is furthered, if possible, because it always remains in the realm of the ideal.

Even after making allowance for the fact that classical allusions in mediaeval Latin poetry were largely conventional, we have constantly recurring evidence of the attitude in which Italy stood toward the ancient political world in the works of the panegyrists and chroniclers. When Sergius III. was elected Pope, in 904, he signalized his possession of the chair of the pontiffs by an administration of marked political success. Vulgarius addressed a poem to him in which the ancient glory of Rome is recalled:

Aurea priscorum reparat nunc saecula virorum,
Scipiadas claros, Fabios gentemque togatam,
Fasces curules anulos ac paludamenta,
Palmatas tunicas, trabeam falerasque nitentes.
Imperium renovat herorum nomenque priorum.

This emulation of an antiquity that was ever present to the Italians is indicated in the reference to the Punic Wars in a Pisan poem written in honor of the victory of Pisa over the Saracens, in 1088. This is the more interesting because it is contained in one of those popular rhymes with which the townsmen celebrated of the stirring incidents of their civic and military life:

Inclytorum Pisanorum scripturus historiam
Antiquorum Romanorum renovo memoriam;

Nam extendit modo Pisa laudem admirabilem
Quam olim recepit Roma vincendo Carthaginem.*

In the watch song of Mantua already quoted Greece is *fraudulenta Graecia*, and the whole sympathy of the Italian is with his mythical ancestors. We can hardly imagine an Italian writer, like Hildebert of Lavardin, putting into the mouth of mediaeval Rome such words as these :

Maior sum pauper divite, stante iacens ;
Plus aquilis vexilla crucis, plus Caesare Petrus :†

Even the peasant

Favoleggiando colla sua famiglia.
De Troiani, e di Fiesole, e di Roma,

and the Neapolitan lazzaroni with their grotesque Vergilian legends cherished a vague feeling of proprietorship in the heroes whose exploits they no longer understood.‡ As we approach the dawn of the Renaissance this pride of lineage becomes heightened, especially in men of poetic imagination. Dante is inspired with patriotic enthusiasm at contemplating the great deeds of the Romans, and traces back the history of Italy uninterrupted from his own time to that of Aeneas.§ Petrarch speaks of the Romans in the same familiar, matter-of-fact way that he does of contemporary Italians, or that we do of the Pilgrim Fathers.||

The municipal organizations of Italy retained many traces of Roman institutions.¶ Some of the guilds of the Italian cities may date back to the early *collegia*. There is a notice of the arts of Naples in the sixth century, and of a *collegium* of fishers at Ravenna in the eighth. We might fancy as much for the bakers from the resemblance of Pompeian loaves to those of modern Italy.

It is possible that some forms of imperial corruption and luxury, from which most of Western Europe seems to have been purged, survived in Italy, though this may have been partly due to closer contact with the East. Unnatural vices are hinted at in the *Inferno*,** and they shot up such a rank growth in Italy at the time of the Renaissance as to suggest the thought that their seeds were already present in the nation. In the ninth century Ratherius has to warn his priests against the custom of introducing lewd songs and female dancers at banquets.†† The survival of a heathen custom may explain the warning addressed by a bishop of Verona to his

* Cf. also *Ottonis Frisingensis Chronicon*, M. H. G., sc. 20, 312, 11, 19-20 ; *inter nuncios interpellat, virtutem liberalitatis antiquorum Romanorum eis ad memoriam reducens, per haec postulata ab eis adepisci existimaret.*

† Hildebert de Lavardin, *Notices des Manuscrits*, T. 28, part 2, p. 289.

‡ Cf. Comparetti, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

§ For instance in the sixth canto of the *Paridiso*.

|| *Ad. Fam.* 8, 4: *Coquus, inquam, quod non latet, apud maiores olim nostros vilissimum mancipium, victa demum Asia in pretio haberi coeptum. Nunquam utinam armis Asiam vicissemus, ne unquam suis illa deliciis nos vicisset.* (Cf. *Livy.*, XXXIX., 6.)

¶ *In civitatum quoque dispositione ac reipublicae conservatione antiquorum adhuc Romanorum imitantur solertiam.*

** Cf. the fifteenth canto of the *Inferno*.

†† P. L. CXXXVI., p. 292, A: *Tecum [sc. in conviviis] symphonia et omnia musicorum genera, cantorum lenocinia, saltatricum pestis.*

priests, directing them to forbid what seems to have been the common custom of singing *carmina diabolica* over the dead, at night.*

A pleasanter side of this vein of ancient life running through Italian history is afforded by the continuance there of secular culture. This term may be understood as meaning two things. It may refer to the study of ancient pagan, as distinguished from Christian literature. Or it may indicate that this study was a favorite pursuit of the laity as well as of the clerical classes. This second aspect of the question is one that most particularly concerns us in the case of Italy, but the first has a not unimportant bearing upon our subject.

The hostile attitude that the Church assumed toward pagan literature has already been remarked. That this hostility continued more pronounced in Italy than elsewhere may be a negative indication of the fact that secular letters were more popular in that country, so that the former feeling of rivalry was not allowed to die out. No such antagonism to the classical writers seems to have been present in the Irish and English schools. Quite the reverse. Alcuin writes that he is exerting himself to intoxicate his pupils with the strong wine of ancient learning.† And although in his later years, when under the influence of continental environment and Italian ideals to some extent, he turned his thoughts more exclusively to theology, the sum total of his influence was humanistic. If his pupil Rabanus takes the Gregorian position, it is because his opposition to profane literature is based upon ethical grounds rather than upon considerations of faith or dogma.‡ Even today people might be found who would not consider Ovid and Catullus just the authors to put into the hands of young persons and to make the basis of their literary training. Much of the popular literature—*lascivae cantilenae*—was as corrupt in content without any redeeming elegance of form, drummers' stories of the looser sort, the adventures of the Decameron and Hep-tameron without their literary polish. But in Italy the old partisan feeling remains. The spirit of antiquity has never been so far subdued as to become perfectly innocuous. It is irreligion, corruption of faith more than corruption of morals, that disturbs the Italian ecclesiastic.

If we compare Italy with Gaul, whose literary culture rivaled that of the mother country of Latin at some periods of the Empire, a difference too great to be explained by the political vicissitudes of a single century appears after the close of the first invasion. The letters of Sidonius Apollinaris describe Gallic country seats of the fifth century in whose owners' libraries the secular writers and those of the Church found an equally honorable position.§ A hundred years sufficed practically to annihilate this culture, and by the time of Gregory it had disappeared. In the Italy of Cassiodorus, who belongs to the same century with Gregory though about half a generation before him, the interest in profane literature is so active that the study of the sacred writings languishes, and the wordly

* P. L. CXXXVI., p. 1853: *Cantus et choris mulierum in atrio ecclesiae prohibite; Carmina diabolica quae super mortuos nocturnis horis vulgus cantare solet—vetate.*

† Ep. 43, Pl. C., 208, B. *Aliis-sanctarum mella scripturarum ministrare satago, alios vetere antiquarum disciplinarum mero inebriare satago.*

‡ *Prohibetur Christianus legere fragmenta poetarum, quia per oblectamenta inanum fabularum mentem excitat ad incitamenta libidinum.*

§ Cf. Ep. 29. M. G. H. s. a., 8. P. L. LVIII., 484, B.

writers displace those of the Church.* In the tenth century, when the cathedral and monastery schools of Charles were just taking root in the North, a crazy grammarian of Ravenna created a public tumult by preaching what seems to have been a sort of pagan crusade.† “Like all the Italians” he neglected the other arts for grammar—*i. e.*, poetry and rhetoric—and inspired by the shades of Vergil, Horace, and Juvenal, began to revile the sacred writings and extol those of the poets. This new creed found many adherents and was put down with fire and sword. Through the obscure and prejudiced account of the monkish chronicler we doubtless see a premature, mediæval attempt at a classical revival. Another writer of this period laments that the youth are so carried away with enthusiasm for poetry that they waste their time in schools of rhetoric (?) and divert high gifts of genius to these unworthy pursuits.‡ Ratherius protests against their having more concern about the marriage of Mercury and Philology than that of Christ and a faithful soul, and their inquiring more diligently into the occasion of the spots upon the moon than those upon their own consciences.§

The quotation recently cited from Cassiodorus also suggests the important fact that not only were secular letters studied in Italy in his time, but that they were taught by lay teachers, probably successors of the grammarians who taught at Rome and in the other Italian cities in the time of the Empire.|| We have evidence that such lay masters continued all through the Middle Ages. They taught what were probably private schools. To this class belong Felix and his nephew Flavian, who taught at Ticinum in the seventh century, the latter of whom was the master of Paulus Diaconus.¶ Probably Honorius and Ioanicius, of Ravenna, who were famous in the ** sixth and seventh centuries as teachers of grammar and poetry and the Vilgardus mentioned above were of this class. A papal canon of 826 directs masters and teachers skilled in literature and the liberal arts be appointed,†† and another canon twenty-seven years later, in the darkest period of Italian history, speaks of teachers of the liberal arts as being at that time rarely found among the common people.‡‡ But that they should have existed at all is

* P. L. LXX., 1200. *Cum studia saecularium litterarum—fervere cognoscerem—gravissimo sum, fateor, dolore permotus, quod scriptoribus divinis magistri publici deessent, cum mundani auctores celeberrima procul dubio traditione pollerent.* Cf. also, Var. Ep. 2, 3; 2, 15; 3, 11; M. G. H. s. c., 10, and P. L. LXIX., 501 et seq.

† Rec. 10, 23. *Quidam, Vilgardus dictus, studio artis grammaticae magis assiduus—sicut Italici semper mos fuit artes negligere ceteras, illam sectare.—Is enim cum ex scientia suae artis coepisset inflatus superbia stultior apparere, quadam nocte assumpsere daemones poetarum species Virgilii et Horatii atque Iuvenalis, apparentes illi fallaces retulerunt gratias quoniam suorum dicta voluminum carius amplectens exerceret.—Hisque daemonum fallacis depravatus coepit multa turgida docere fidei sacrae contraria, dictaque poetarum per omnia credenda esse asserabat.*

‡ M. G. H., s. 3, 534. *Studiis incitati carminum, ludo insistentes poetico, ad naeniarum garrulitates alta diventerunt ingenia.*

§ P. L. *Frequenter sermonem habent de nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae, rarum vel nullum de copula Christi et fidelis animi—diligenter scrutantur unde macula in luna, sed advertere nolunt si macula sit in conscientia.*

|| Cf. Suet. de Grammaticis, 3.

¶ Cf. Hist. Long.: M. G. H.

** Mur. Script. 1, 493; 2, 151.

†† *Magistri et doctores constituantur qui, studia litterarum liberaliumque artium habentes, dogmata assidue doceant.*

‡‡ *Si liberalium artium praeceptores in plebibus, ut assolet, raro inveniuntur, tamen divinae scripturae magistri nullatenus desint.*

what distinguishes Italy from other lands. A century later Ratherius writes that in addition to those who attended the episcopal and monastery schools there were those who *apud quemlibet sapientem conversati sunt*. In the time of Louis the Second there are reported to have been thirty-two *philosophi*, men of distinguished learning according to mediaeval ideas, at Beneventum alone.* Some of these were doubtless private teachers, unattached to any institution. For the following century it is sufficient to say that Peter Damiani and Lanfranc, and the founder of the Roman law revival, Irnerius, were lay teachers for part of their lives. In documents of the tenth and eleventh centuries names of *magistri* and *scholastici* who were evidently laymen appear frequently.† As in imperial times, teachers become very wealthy from the gains of their profession. The schools were attended by the young nobles, as we have already mentioned, as well as by those who were destined for the Church. The contrast between Italy and Germany in this respect is indicated in the panegyric addressed to Henry the Third by Wippo:

Hoc servant Itali post prima erepundia cuncti
Et sudare scholis mandatur tota inventus.
Solis Teutonicis vacuum vel turpe videtur
Ut doceant aliquem, nisi clericus accipiatur.

The persistence of secular letters and lay culture in Italy doubtless accounts for the existence of a certain rationalistic, semi-modern spirit among the Italians of the Middle Ages. Ratherius mentions them as above all other nations despisers of the canon law and the clergy. Frederick the Second could laugh at an excommunication and his realm scarce felt the inconvenience of an interdict that would have humiliated and imperilled any sovereign of northern Europe. From his court emanated the liberal skepticism of Epicurus, with its *Unus est interitus hominis et iumentorum*, to reappear later with Valla as an ethical code. A Pythagorean society seems to have existed in the Etruscan cities.‡ Scholasticism of the extreme, hair-splitting kind never got a firm hold in Italy.§ Juristic studies and medicine prevailed at the universities. Political conditions and continuous tradition from classical times accounted for this in case of law, but in case of medicine, especially at Salernum, it was due in part to Arabic influence.||

Finally, there seems to have been in Italy throughout the Middle Ages some sense of form and style, a taste for literary excellence that we rarely find elsewhere during this period. The indirect evidence of this is found in the smoothness of Italian verse as compared with that of the northern countries, the variety of metre, the frequent classical allusions, the pagan spirit which frequently breathes through the poems of the Peninsula. The literary revival in France in

*Mur. Script. 2, 279, A: *Tempore quo Ludovicus imperavit, scilicet Lotharii filius, triginta duos philosophos Beneventum habebat. Quo vocabulo prisci illi adpellare consuevere artes sectantes humaniores.*

† Giesebrecht, op. cit., 7 et seq.

‡ Gebhardt, op. cit., 80: *Les principales villes de Toscane et de Puille renfermaient une société secrète de pythagoriciens auxquels Arnauld de Villeneuve fut affilié.* Cf. id., 81.

§ Gebhardt, op. cit. 57; Thurot, op. cit., 92.

|| Cf. Giesebrecht, op. cit., 35, the account of Constantinus Afer, the Carthaginian monk who had studied at Bagdad and translated many Greek and Arabic medical works into Latin for the benefit of the Casiniensian monastery.

the twelfth and thirteenth centuries came from Italy, and that land was a source of inspiration for the men of letters who rendered famous in its time the court of Henry the Second of England.* Law seems to have driven letters north of the Alps for a period. We are told that the teachers before Anselm and Lanfranc came into France were hardly to be compared to the strolling clerks of the next generation. In fact the Goliardi themselves may have transplanted the first seedlings of their literature from Lombardy, which was in the eleventh century the *fons sapientiae*—as a contemporary writer puts it—of Europe. The poem which was most representative of them was written in Italy. They seem to have derived from Italian sources some of the pagan spirit that characterized their songs. They were the popular representatives of the Epicurean doctrines that prevailed at the court of Frederick II. As they themselves confess :

Magis credunt Iuvenali
Quam doctrinae prophetali,
Vel Christi scientiae ;
Deum discunt esse Bacchum,
Et pro Marcu legunt Flaccum,
Et pro Paulo Vergilium.

The spirit here represented is quite Italian, more characteristic of Italy at least than of any other country at this time. But we have another poem that was certainly written in Lombardy, in the latter half of the eleventh century, that reproduces all the pagan feeling of Italian poetry. It is a sort of spring idyl written in leonine elegiacs and published with the title *Versus Eporedienses*,† a love poem the theme of which is the conversation of a poet and a young maiden upon the banks of the Po. He promises her, for her love, all the treasures of the world and finally the immortality of verse. The poem opens with the spring exordium :

Tempus erat florum, quod fons est omnis amorum ;

the maiden traces her ancestry to the gods ;

Si proavos quaeris, dis vim fecisse videris,
Sanguine de quorum me sapit omne forum.

A long enumeration of the riches which the amorous poet will prodigal upon his mistress follows, a list that gives us an interesting and suggestive hint of the opulence and luxury of the Lombard cities at this time. In the closing lines there is a eulogy of poetry and a proclaiming of the immortality of the Muses that is either pagan or Renaissance in its spirit :

Sum sum sum vates, Musarum servo penates,
Subpeditante Clio quaeque futura scio.

* * *

Musa mori nescit, nec in annis mille senescit,
Durans durabit, nec quod amavit abit,
Quod decet ore teri vivit dictamen Omeri,
Et facit esse deum quem coluit Nereum.

* John of Salisbury had crossed the Alps ten times, and had made two tours through southern Italy. *Policraticus*, I, 4. Walter Napes had at least been in Rome.

† Published by Dümmler, *op. cit.*

Indeed, and this is a fact having its bearing upon both mediaeval Latin and that of the Renaissance, the night of the Dark Ages in Italy was like these summer nights of Britain described above, where the evening twilight melts into the morning dawn. Letters had been at home in Italy so long when the final breaking up of the Empire came that they had permeated all the strata of society, had put root too deep to be eradicated even by the passing deluge of a barbarian invasion.* In the rude Merovingian age, when all sympathy with learning seems to have disappeared from Northern Europe, the Lombard princes still cherished the waning light of letters in their dominions.† The glory of ancient Rome continued to be a source of inspiration and hope to the Italian, a bond of common sympathy, the only element of conscious nationality that survived, an ideal after which—so far as it was revealed to him—he tried to regulate his social and political life.‡ The laymen, even if he produced little in literature, still read his Vergil and his Horace;§ with him the blind superstition of religious life was tempered with ray of liberal enlightenment; his lay culture withstood the all-absorbing influence of the church.|| Neither romanticism or scholasticism ever either completely submerged or dominated his intellectual life;¶ but those studies which were based most directly upon ancient thought, grammar and law and medicine, appealed most strongly to his interest and ambition. In his literature the presence of artistic ideals manifests itself, more especially in the department of poetry, and even though it be but part of a conventional tradition, the form and features of his verse are determined to a greater extent than elsewhere by pagan figures and mythology.**

One word remains to be said upon mediaeval Latin as a whole, apart from its different periods of development and its employment in different spheres of literature. We cannot judge this language justly if we insist upon regarding it from the point of view of classical scholars. It was an instrument for the expression of thought. It was not regarded by those who employed it either as a mental universal exerciser, or an instrument for philological and historical investigations. Its literary crudeness was a fact of culture rather than of language, a feature that it possessed in common with the vulgar tongues. Had it been a dead language, it would have retained the form it first received in death, or have disappeared entirely. Its users

* Nicht mit völligem Unrecht könnte man behaupten dass Italien in Bezug auf die Cultur ein Mittelalter gar nicht gehabt hat. Körting, A. R. I., p. 93.

† The Lombard prince Arrichis and his wife Adilperga and their son Romaldus are mentioned by Paulus Diaconus as patrons of letters. In the epitaph of the first this is expressly mentioned :

Ornasti patrum doctrinis, moenibus, aulis.

‡ Sismondi, *Histoire des Républiques Italiennes*, II, 34, 36, 40, 166, 255.

§ Die Italienische Laie las seinen Virgil und Horaz, aber schrieb keine Bücher. Wittenbach, *Geschichtsquellen*, I., 293. Comparetti partially questions this view. He associates the desire of the Italian laity to be initiated into classical culture with the development of vernacular literature; but fails to explain why this influence of the vernacular should have been peculiar to Italy. o. c., 190.

|| La cultura e poesia d'Italia conservò in parte un carattere laico, e oppose una continua resistenza alle forse assorbenti dell'elemento chiesastico. Ronca, o. c., 90.

¶ Cf. Comparetti, p. 251.

** Names of pagan deities appear often in Italian prose. For instance, Nelli, Prior of the Church of the Sacred Apostles, Florence writes with reference to Petrarch's return from his German trip : *Pro cuius felici reditu summo Iovi assiduas preces fudi*. Cochon, o. c., *Ep.* 16.

looked upon it as a living language. It was as natural that the clerk should have his language as it was that the layman should talk a vulgar idiom, a *lingua laica*.^{*} The Latin language was *grammatica*, the language of definite form and rule and structure, while the *lingua laica* was, in the eyes of the mediæval scholar, the floating, lawless, shifting dialect of the masses, something savoring of "leeks and garlic" and ostracized forever from good society by the streak of servile blood in its veins.

If we except some constructions that were occasional in classical Latin, such as the use of *quod* clauses for the infinitive subject accusative, and the loose use of the subjunctive and the modern word order, the syntax of the better Middle Age writers is not very different from that of the Romans. Their prose does not lack perspicuity and clearness. Occasionally, as in the sermons of St. Bernard, it rises to the higher graces of literary style. Luitprandt, of Cremona, in the tenth century, and Roger Bacon, of England, wrote Latin prose that does not fall far short of that of the later Empire.† But this Latin must be judged according to its own laws and standards.

In the time of Charles there was an effort to restore Latin to its ancient form. Einhard, as we have seen, copied the style and language of Suetonius. His contemporary and friend, Lupus of Ferrières, was a humanist in ideals and impulses, and would have brought Latin back to its Ciceronian standard.‡ But this feeling was foreign to the great mass of Latin writers of the Middle Ages. The field of view of many of those who sought to mould their style on ancient usage reached no farther back than the Vulgate. That book is quoted by a ninth century grammarian as an authority superior to that of the classical writers. It is almost heresy to suppose that a Greek construction could creep into a good orthodox book like the Latin Bible, and Donatus must make way for the Holy Scriptures.§

A few centuries later, when scholasticism had bred a feeling of independence

^{*}Cf. Thurot, op. cit., p. 131: *Latinorum populorum quidam laici dicuntur, et quidem clerici.—Laici vero dicuntur habere idioma—quæ docentur pueri a matribus et a parentibus.—Clerici vero Latinis dicuntur habere idioma—et istud docenter pueri in scholis a grammaticis.* Thurot quotes this from a tenth-century grammarian.

†Luitprandt sometimes gives up the *quod* clauses even, and Bacon had modern ideas about a critical revision of texts. This is what he says about the Vulgate: o. c., page 46; *Probatum est quod codices Latini sunt omnino corrupti.—Ex translatione mala hæc accidit et corruptione eius per Latinos; nec est remedium nisi de novo transferantur, vel ad singulas radices corrigantur.*

‡Compare his letters passim (1, 5, 8, 16, 37, 62, 104); P. L. CXIX., 433, A. *Amor litterarum ab ipso fere initio pueritiæ mihi est innatus, nec earum, ut nunc a plerisque vocantur, superstitiosa otia fastidio sunt. Et nisi intercessisset inopia præceptorum et longo situ collapsa priorum studia paene interissent, largiente Domino, meae aviditati satisfacere forsitan potuissem;* and also P. L. CXXX., 434, A. *Dictatus nostra ætate confecti displicerent, propterea quod ab illa Tulliana ceterorumque gravitate, quam insigne quoque Christianæ religionis viri æmulati sunt, oberrarent.*

§Thurot, o. c., page 85. *Multi dicunt opus non est dicere "ego lego" aut "ego legam," quia "lego" cum dicit aliquis aut "legi" aut "legam" personam pariter absolute demonstrat et tempus. Sed nos, quod divinarum Scripturarum plura instruunt testimonia, hæc dicere non formidamus.* Of such expressions as *da mihi bibere*, *da mihi manducare*, he says, *Quam figuram locutionis multi Graecam esse magis volunt quam Latinam. Nos vero Latinam eam tenemus, quia in divinis scripturis eam invenimus.* And again, *Quod vero dicit Donatus quia clam præpositio casibus servit ambobus, quaerat lector; ego autem non memoro ubi accusativo in divinis Scripturis serviat casui.*

and confidence in the mediaeval schools, Middle Age literature itself was made a basis for grammar, upon a par with the Vulgate and the classical citations of Priscian and Donatus. In the Doctrinal of Alexander de Villedieu, a metrical grammar that was supreme in the schools during the century preceding the Renaissance, we find the following :

Accentus normas legitur posuisse vetustas ;
Non tamen has credo servandas tempore nostro.

And in a commentary upon the poem we are told that while Priscian gave rules for nouns employed in his time, these need not necessarily be observed in case of words of later formation ; * and Horace is quoted to support the position of the commentator.

Similar independence is observable in the new prosody. The elaborate classification of the hexameter has already been mentioned. Elision was allowed in ancient verse, but is not to be favored in modern verse, *non quia non liceat, sed quoniam rustico modo prolatum videtur*. Rhyme and rhythmical verse, like that of the Goliards, has become the subject of elaborate rules of prosody. † The tendency to take liberties with the language in poetry was carried to great excess sometimes. Writers seem actually to have revelled in barbarisms and solecisms, the poet should coin new words freely, such as *canonicare, tigridor, ursior* ; he should combine antithetical words, employ indeclinable words as declinable, change quantities, transpose prepositions,—do anything to create what it seems to have been thought would be a pleasing impression of surprise upon the part of the reader. ‡

But this was the extreme, the abnormal manifestation of what was within moderate bounds the rule. Latin was looked upon as a living language, *sui iuris*, neither in its infancy or its dotage, and it was treated accordingly. §

There is very little that is akin in the mediaeval and the modern man. For this reason, perhaps, neither the language nor the literature of the Middle Ages appeals to us. The Roman gentleman of the first century or the Florentine literateur of the fourteenth would be an interesting man to meet, a companion, one whom we could understand and take into our sympathies. But the monk or the schoolman has a sort of Chinese foreignness about him, the strangeness of our intellectual antipodes. With a few exceptions we take up the writings that pleased him with the curiosity of the investigator rather than with the enjoyment of the reader.

* Thurot, o. c., page 113. *Priscianus dabat regulas de nominibus in tempore suo usitatis. Sed cum illa (sc. nomina Graeca et barbara primae declinationis) serius accepta essent, non obstat quin bene sub genere neutro reponantur. Et hoc est quod dicit Horatius in poetria sua: Multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula. Sic volet usus.*

† Thurot, o. c., 453 et seq.

‡ Compare the quotations from Geoffrey Vinesauf and Eberhard von Bethune in Francke, *Lateinische Schulpoesie*, page 19.

§ Körting, A. R. I., page 203 : *Das Mittelalterliche Latein will betrachtet sein als das, was er war : nicht als eine künstliche Büchersprache, nicht als eine durch Unwissenheit und Unfähigkeit verschuldete Entstellung des alten Schriftlateins, sondern als eine lebende Sprache, die, wenn auch immerhin ihre Elemente theoretisch und in Anschluss an altlateinische Grammatiken gelehrt wurden, doch auch durch den mündlichen Gebrauch überliefert wurde.*

If the round of thought of the mediaeval clerk was narrow, if his intellectual life was sterile, it was natural that the language that expressed that life should be arid and barren too. The Latin of the Middle Ages is not an elegant language, one of force and vigor or of varied literary expressiveness. But it is a living language, as its very self-adaptation to its new environment proves. It was the medium in which mediaeval culture functioned, and through which that culture has been expressed to us.

PART TWO.

LATIN OF THE RENAISSANCE.

I.

We have seen in the previous chapter that the literary barrenness of the Middle Ages was due primarily to the predominance of intellectual and spiritual ideals and systems of thought that were unfavorable to the development of individuality, that trimmed and pruned men into conformity with the monastic or clerical standard, and discouraged that freedom and spontaneity which is necessary for the development of genius. Of course, in the complex interrelations of social life it is impossible to single out every influence that was at work in moulding the thought and letters of the Mediaeval period, or to trace out fully to their ultimate sources in the external conditions peculiar to that age the immediate causes of its literary sterility. We have seen that a vivid thought transient revival of the grand conception of a world empire under Charles the Great brought with it also a premature revival of literary activity. But true literature, in the artistic sense of the word, could only be recovered through the medium of the vulgar speech. That speech itself was kept in a sort of social eclipse by the presence of its elder sister, until it burst suddenly upon the world in full maturity with Dante. We are not overlooking the fact that a vigorous native literature existed before Dante's time. But the consciousness of immortal genius, of a literary masterpiece, of the possibility of literature existing as a separate profession and aim in life became with him once more something real. Emulation and a new ideal were awakened. If such things could be attained in the vulgar tongue, how much greater the possible achievements of those great masters who were to awaken again the lyre of ancient Rome. Dante himself had acknowledged Vergil as his master, and had first contemplated writing his own great epic in Latin verse. Latin still had the reverence of all Western Europe as the great medium of letters, as the world language. Her sway in this respect was still centuries from its close. It is not strange, then, that wherever secular education rendered possible, and the presence of a great master whose memory was still vivid in the minds of the people rendered inevitable the awakening of literary aspiration, the devotees at the shrine of the Muses should turn their first attention to the great masters of antiquity and to the literary idiom in which they wrote.

The conception of literary immortality was not entirely a stranger to the Middle Ages. A certain amount of aspiration or self-confidence in this respect must be assumed in order to explain an author's writing at all. Naso, one of the courtiers of Charles the Great, thus commences the prologue to his eclogues :

Caesareis Carolus sapiens haec auribus hauri
Carmina quae nulla sunt peritura die.

But this cento or paraphrase from Ovid does not imply that sort of literary inspiration upon the part of the writer, that modestly audacious consciousness of fame, that we find in Petrarch where he sings :

E sua fama, che spira
In molte parti ancor per le tua lingua,
Prega che non estingua. *

It is to Laura the personification of his highest aspirations rather than to the mundane Laura of flesh and blood that Petrarch sings in such passages as these. The listless ennui, the *acedia* of the cloister has given place to the restless, aspiring melancholy of genius working toward new and ever attainable ideals, and to that manifestation of heightened subjectivity that we find in modern literature and has been named by the Germans *Weltschmerz*.

But it is its inspiration only, not its form, it is this conception of literary immortality as something again attainable and worth striving for, that Latin literature derived from Dante. And it is wonderful with what enthusiasm this new idea was embraced by the generations of Latinists that immediately followed him. Perhaps the extreme directness and personality of the Divine Comedy contributed to produce this result. Latin letters had rendered imperishable the renown and glory of that long line of heroes that extended from Achilles to Caesar and Pompey and Augustus. While the lamp of learning was extinguished the features of their successors, even of Charlemagne and Barbarossa, became dim and distorted in the fitful light of Romance. Now, with the reënlighment of the world, through the revival of classic letters, a new race of heroes was to receive the canonization of literature, and to become immortalized through the poems and histories of a new generation of writers. Petrarch expresses this creed more than once in the Africa : †

Quisquis enim se magna videt gessisse, necesse est
Diligat æternos vates et carmina sacra.

Æternos connoted *Latinos* with Petrarch and with those who succeeded him. His own works in the vulgar tongue, those of his friend Boccaccio, and even the Divine Comedy itself were less esteemed among the learned than the Latin works of their respective authors. Manetti, who lived a century after Dante, prefaced his lives of these three poets with the explanation that, as their reputation with the learned rested mainly upon their Latin works, it was his object especially to emphasize the merit of their Italian writings, in order to secure for these among scholars that appreciation *quæ in plebecula hactenus latere videbatur*.‡

Dante's Latin works belong to the Middle Ages rather than to the Renaissance, or at least to the very dawn of that classical revival that culminated in

* Canzone 2, in *Morte di Madonna Hama*, stanza 7, o. c., page 102.

† Africa, IX., 97.

‡ A curious illustration of the superior dignity of Latin writings in the mind of Petrarch is given by Nohac, o. c., page 51, note 4. It is a quotation from a Pisan memoir, as follows : *Io mi trovai una fiata in Lombardia e visitai messer Francesco a Milano il quale per sua cortesia mi tenne seco più di. E stando uno di con lui nel suo studio, lo domandai si v'avea il libro di Dante, e mi rispose di sì; sorge e cercato fra suoi libri il sopradetto libretto chiamato Moncaccia e gettollomi innanzi. In ep. sen. v 3, however, Petrarch calls Dante, *Dux nostri eloquii vulgaris*.*

Italy a century later. We are told that he began the Divine Comedy in Latin, even that he wrote several cantos in that language before finally deciding to compose it in the vernacular. The first lines of this poem, though quoted differently, are usually given by his early biographers as,

Ultima regna canam fluido contermina mundo,
Spiritus quae late patent, quae praemia solvunt
Pro meritis cuicumque suis.

There were also four Latin translations of the poem, one of which dates from as early as 1380. A couple of Latin eclogues, whose authenticity is questioned,* are published in Dante's collected works. They are occasional poems, written in reply to similar compositions addressed to himself. There is something of the conventionality of literary exercises about them, that gives little hint of either originality or genius on the part of their author, though they suggest in no dubious way Dante's great Roman "maestro," as the following introduction to the first eclogue sufficiently testifies :

Vidimus in nigris albo patiente lituris
Pierio demulsa sinu modulamina nobis.
Forte recensentes pastas de more capellas,
Tunc ego sub quercu, meus et Melibeus eram :

Dante's Latin works illustrate the fact, however, that in respect to form the poetry of the Middle Ages was vastly better than its prose.† Verse lends itself more easily to semi-artificial forms of expression ; the similarity of theme as well as of form kept alive the influence of classical models ; and centos were more readily employed where memory was assisted by metre.

The prose of Dante belongs to literary Latin, not to the popular, Romanesque Latin of the popular chronicles and the *Gesta Romanorum*. But his style is not purified in the least from the thousand and one corruptions or modifications that theological, and especially scholastic, literature had introduced. Besides a few letters we have a geographical or cosmographical monograph entitled *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*, interesting as an example of the pre-Baconian way of discussing such a subject ; a political treatise of considerable importance *De Monarchia*, which was once condemned as heretical, and is by far the most celebrated of Dante's prose works ; and *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, which is in some respects intrinsically the most interesting of the three to a modern reader, despite the fact that it is incomplete. There are a number of notices regarding the early dialects and the vernacular literature of the Romance tongues in this work that are interesting and valuable, and we are inclined to be surprised at the extent to which the previous popular literature had become a subject for study and comparison with Dante. In discussing the dialects of Latin, as he recalls the Romance languages, he gives the Italian the preference over the Langue d'Oïl and the Langue d'Oc, *quia magis videtur inniti Grammaticae (i. e., Latinae) quae communis est ; quod rationabiliter insipientibus videtur gravissimum argumentum*. He excludes Sardinian from the Italian literary dialects, *quoniam soli sine proprio vulgari esse*

* Macri-Leone, o. c., pp. 48-54.

† Also later in Roman period.

videntur, Grammaticam tamquam simiae homines imitantes: nam 'domus mea' et 'Dominus meus' loquuntur. He speaks of the Roman dialect as, *non vulgare, sed potius trisilium, Italarum vulgarium omnium turpissimum.* We are told of the Langue d'Oïl, *quod propter sui faciliorem ac delectabiliorem vulgaritatem, quicquid redactum sive inventum est ad vulgare prosaicum suum est: videlicet bibilia cum Troianorum Romanorumque gestibus compilata, et Arturi regis ambages pulcherrimae.* And of the Langue d'Oc he says, *quod vulgares eloquentes in ea primum poetati sunt, tamquam in perfectiori dulciorique loquela.* In the chapter entitled, *De Varia Constructione qua Utendum est in Cantibus*, after citing illustrations from ten Romance poets he concludes with the following reference to the classical authors: *Et fortassis utilissimum foret ad illam (sc. supremam, i. e., optimam constructionem) habituandam regulatos vidisse poetas, Virgilium videlicet, Ovidium in Metamorphoseos, Statium atque Lucanum, nec non alios qui usi sunt altissimas prosas, ut Tullium, Livium, Plinium, Frontinum, Paulum, Orosium, et multos alios quos amica solitudo nos visitare invitat.* *Amica solitudo* is an oft-repeated refrain in Petrarch. This passage is the nearest to a prophecy of the Renaissance of anything we find in Dante's Latin.

It is hardly necessary to point out the barbarisms and solecisms in the above quotations. The language is mediæval, with scarcely a suggestion of classical influence in it. With the rise of a popular literature in the vulgar tongues the circle of Latin readers was rapidly growing smaller, and there seems to have been little premonition of the reaction in favor of that language that was soon to come. According to Boccaccio, Dante wrote his great poem in Italian partly from this consideration; because liberal studies were abandoned by all, and even the divine works of Vergil and the other great poets were fallen into little esteem and generally 'neglected.* The colloquial use of Latin, even in official business, was probably becoming much less common than it had been in the previous centuries. Numerous instances that seem to prove the contrary might be cited, but certainly during the next two hundred years, when every facility for the acquisition and mastery of the classical languages was provided, and their study was prosecuted with an enthusiasm and devotion that were unknown even when they were flourishing as national tongues, no such retrograde movement could have taken place otherwise as to justify Erasmus' statement that it was merely employed formally even in ecclesiastical councils and great embassies, and that the actual business was even then transacted in French.†

It is probable that during the whole Renaissance period the tendency to confine the colloquial use of Latin to the scholarly minority was becoming more and more marked. There was a great gap growing up between the popular Latin of the monasteries and universities and the Latin of the humanists, that tended to

* *Veggendo li liberali studi del tutto essere abbandonati,—veggendo le divine opere di Virgilio e quelle degli alteri solenni poeti venute in non calere e quasi refutate de tutti.* Vita di Dante.

† Ciceronianus, Op. Om.; I, 1004, C and D: *Neque multo maior usus in conciliis, ubi singuli paucis aperiant quod videtur, idque Gallice aut Germanice.—Quid igitur superest usus, nisi forte in legationibus quæ Romæ præsertim Latine peraguntur, ex more magis quam ex animo, et magnificentiae causa potius quam utilitatis gratia? Hic itaque præter salutationis officium nihil agitur; quod est serium privatim literis et Gallicis colloquiis peragitur.*

bring the former into disrepute, while the cultivated vernacular tended to displace it entirely. In other words, a repetition of the process that went on at Rome in the classical age was taking place; the literary language was becoming more and more estranged from the vulgar dialects. But the analogy stopped here; for in the latter case it was the literary idiom that survived, though in a limited sphere of usefulness, and the quasi-plebeian Latin of the clerical commons that disappeared.

But if the practical use of Latin in official business and among the literary commonality was becoming less general, its elegant use—if we may employ the term—within the comparatively restricted sphere left to it, suffered no detriment from this fact, and its literary purity was probably furthered by it. It was the only medium employed in formal communications; it was the colloquial language of scholars.*

As we shall see later, though Erasmus knew neither Italian or English, he spent years in those countries, published books at Venice and gave instruction at English universities. Two centuries after Dante, then, a period almost as long as that which separates the age of Milton from our own, Latin still held its own as the speech of the literary aristocracy of Europe. More than that. During these two centuries it had regained much of its former elegance and purity; so that from a merely formal point of view it was hardly to be distinguished from that written by the more cultivated Romans. If the literary monuments of the period have not attained as high a position in the world's esteem as those of the former age, it is because they lack inspiration and vital connection with the life of the day, not because of any defect in the medium through which they have been expressed to us. We can hardly imagine Politian or Erasmus or their contemporaries as conscious of any artificial relation to their subject because of their writing in Latin. The words came like those of their mother tongue, only more fluently perhaps when a subject requiring a loftier form of expression was before them.† The artificiality lies deeper than the form or mastery of the language. It is

*A perfect colloquial master of Latin, however, may not have been so common as we are inclined to think. Some of the best known of the humanists did not speak it; even Niccolò di Niccoli, the Florentine *connoisseur*, was among this number. A passage from Muretus is interesting in this connection, and also as throwing some light on Transalpine Latinity in the sixteenth century. The quotation is from the 58th chapter of the *Variae Lectiones*, which opens with an account of a visit paid to Muretus by some German travellers; "*Interfuerat illi sermoni ac colloquio nostro Darius Bernardus, iuuenis et festivo ingenio et sanctis plane atque incorruptis moribus, qui eis digressis; Verum omnino, inquit, est quod dicitur, in nullis hominibus hoc tempore praeterquam in transalpinis promptam atque expeditam reperiri Latine loquendi facultatem. Vel ii, qui modo abierunt, ut nusquam in loquendo haerent, nusquam titubant, nusquam offendunt, ut omnia in numero habent, ut tota eorum sine ullo impedimento ac salubris decurrit oratio! At nostri homines, et iam ii qui sibi e studiorum laboribus pallorem et maciem et senium contraxerunt, si quando Latine loquendum est, ut luctantur, ut sudant, ut anhelant! Credas eos magna vi ex imis pulmonibus verba eruere; cum istis contra sine ulla cura ac cogitatione iugis quaedam ac beata Latinarum vocum copia ultro ore manare ac decurrere videatur. Est istuc quidem, inquam, ita ut dicis, Dari; sed tamen habet et Italia praescalaros viros, quique et ornatissime scribant et disertissime cum opus est loquantur.*"

†The poverty of the vernacular as compared with Latin was felt by the early prose writers: Cf. Sienese manuscript quoted by Comparetti, o. c., page 193: *Le cose spiritali non si possono sì propriamente esprimere per paravole vulgari come si sprimono per latina e per grammatica, per la penuria dei vocabuli volgari.*

found, as it was to a certain extent in the Roman classical writings, in the estrangement from popular life and sympathies which that language created. Literature must have its roots in the ground. Under other conditions it is like a potted palm, vigorous and flourishing in its growth of leaves, but seldom bearing fruit.

II.

Though Petrarch might have stood in filial relation to Dante so far as age was concerned, his maturity falls in a period that is, from a humanistic point of view, as remote from that of the earlier poet, as if centuries had intervened between them. In his Latin, with which we are more particularly concerned, the mediaevalism that characterized Dante's style has almost disappeared. He stands in avowed antagonism to scholasticism and the clerical school in literature. He is a full-fledged humanist, with a humanist's attitude toward secular letters, classical literature, literary immortality; with the emphasized subjectivity, the keen consciousness of self, and much of the pride and confidence and joy in living that marked the reaction from the standards and ideals of the cloister. Petrarch's attitude toward religion itself is humanistic. He steps back over all the mediaeval myths and miracles, the lives of the Saints and the scholastic subtleties, and draws his system of faith from the early Fathers. Augustine was his spiritual guide, and in the *Confessions* of that writer he found the inspiration and encouragement that the religious side of his nature demanded. The latter is the principal interlocutor in three dialogues *De Contemptu Mundi*—a gentle, reverent, but conscientiously exacting character, rather better read in the profane poets than in the Bible.

The genesis of Renaissance Latin literature is illustrated in the literary evolution of Petrarch himself. Like it, he drew his first inspiration from the vulgar tongue and expressed himself in romantic rhyme before he did in Latin. Posterity has exactly reversed the judgment he himself pronounced upon his works, and has remembered him for what he disregarded and forgotten the more pretentious works upon which he based his hopes of fame. Boccaccio, his friend and contemporary, has had a similar experience. His tales, which are still read—sometimes with the added savor of stolen sweets—antedate the rather commonplace Latin works which he modestly hoped would win him the esteem of future generations. But Petrarch's Latin writings really deserve more than the consideration that idle curiosity bestows; for, aside from their biographical interest, they possess many of the elements of true literature.

Petrarch's Latin is by no means perfect. Like himself, it is not entirely free from the effects of mediaeval influences. But he uses it with freedom and facility, and the best possible proof of the advance that he had made in purity of diction is found in the fact that his life of Caesar, through a strange oversight on the part of scholars, was supposed for a long time to be a work of Julius Celsus, an apocryphal contemporary of Caesar himself.* Thirty-four lines of the *Africa* were also pub-

* There is so much internal evidence that would place the authorship of this book at a later date that it seems incredible that it should ever have been mistaken for a work of the Roman period. Graevius, in his edition of 1697, call attention to some of these points, an allusion to Suetonius, another to Augustine, the mention of the Flandri and of the Caesares of Germany. Lemaire, in his edition of 1820, following Bernard de la Monnaye, suggested Petrarch as the author, but left the final proof to Schneider, who definitely settled the question in his edition, published at Leipsic seven years later. Lemaire mentions as a reason for publication, besides the celebrity of the work, *aliquam styli incunditatem*.

lished in 1781, by a French scholar, as a fragment of the *Punica* of Silius Italicus. While scientific criticism was not so far advanced in the eighteenth century as it is at present, the possibility of such errors on the part of men as well read in classical literature as we are to-day, speaks most emphatically for the great improvement that Petrarch had made in the literary language. He was the founder not only of New Latin prose, but indirectly, through this, of Italian prose as well. Nor was his Latin a mere patchwork of classical centos and allusions. So great was his love of individuality of expression that even in compilations he seems purposely to have avoided so far as possible using the words of the author whom he cites.*

An exhaustive classification of Petrarch's Latin works is given in the first volume of Körting's *Geschichte der Literatur Italiens*. Omitting the polemic works, which are unimportant from a literary point of view, the rather stilted orations, and those fragmentary and for the most part uninteresting literary remains that are valuable principally for their biographical data or as giving completeness to his writings, there remain a number of works that are both important and interesting, and on account of their intrinsic merit as well as their subsequent influence are to be regarded as true literary monuments. But we shall adopt a rather different classification from that of Körting, as better fitted to illustrate the peculiar aspect of Petrarch's position in the history of Latin literature which it is our purpose to bring out.

Classical Latin had the function of reproducing and expressing all the various phenomena and interests and thoughts and feelings of ancient life. For that reason it was multiform, shaping itself with protoplasmic adaptability to all the various demands made upon it as the living language of an entire people. During the Middle Ages its field was narrowed down practically to the expression of a single class of conceptions; it was specialized along the theological and formulaic side, and offered a corresponding atrophy of all its other parts. During the Renaissance an effort was made to revive what had been lost. But this revival was and could be only partial. Much of ancient Latin had disappeared forever. Still, the Renaissance Latinist did not feel the limitations that this fact imposed upon his literary medium. He lived in an ideal world, an ancient Rome revived, or his conception of ancient Rome as conveyed to him by classical literature. Though this conception was reasonably complete, it did not take him beyond the limits which Latin, as he knew it, covered. His correspondents were Ciceros and Horaces, his patron a Maecenas, his city an *urbs*, her train bands legions, their captains tribunes and legates. He played at being a Roman all his life. This was all serious and earnest with him, and what was more important, with his contemporaries. He was more than a simple Uncle Toby, because all his neighbors

* This is well illustrated by the following instance from the *Libri Rerum Memorabilium*, given by Baümker, o. c., page 2, where they are used, however, for different purpose: (a) *De Platone, quod Sallustius ait de Carthagine, melius erat tacere quam parum loqui*, where the reference is to Jugurtha, 19, 2; *Nam de Carthagine silere melius puto quam parum dicere*, (b) *Habuit et praeceptores alios, Dionysium in primis scripturarum rudimentis, Aristonem Argivum in palaestra, in qua exercitatissimus evasit*, where the citation is from Apuleius, *de Dogmate Platonis*, l. 1, 2; *Doctores habuit in prima literatura Dionysium; et in palaestra Aristonem Argi oriundum, tantosque progressus exercitatio ei contulit, ut Pythia et Isthmia de luctatu certaverit*.

were Uncle Tobies, too. Such a culture and such a Latin had nothing in common with the mediæval culture and Latin that had immediately preceded it. There has been a reversion in type to a remote ancestor.

The time came, however, when this idealistic Renaissance culture found itself involuntarily drawn into the very vortex of modern life. With the opening of the Reformation its school days were over, and it found itself wrestling with the serious problems of human existence. Classical training and culture became the shield and sword of theological controversy. At one end of this period stands Petrarch, filled with enthusiasm from the new learning, with pagan ideals and love of ancient Rome, but casting half conscience stricken glances ever and anon at the mediævalism that he was leaving. At the other end stands Erasmus, regretfully abandoning the groves of learning for the theological arena, and sorrowfully exchanging the toga for the sagulum. Between these two were several generations of scholars who were with heart and soul, with undivided interest and attention given to the study and the expression of ancient literary ideals. They restored Latin to classical purity and to something like universal application for higher literary purposes. With Erasmus and Melancthon the Latin ceased to be the main thing; it became subservient to the thought. It is the subtle influence of the content that makes the Latin of the Reformation different from that of the Renaissance.

It is possibly due to the fact that they are placed at transition periods that Petrarch and Erasmus were able to infuse into their Latin something of the vital plasticity of the vernacular. The pleasure one takes in their style goes deeper than the intellect; there is an element in it that transcends mere formal correctness; though observing form, it is not dominated by it.

From a purely linguistic standpoint Petrarch's Latin works are practically uniform. They are all thoroughly imbued with the humanistic spirit. But some look toward the Middle ages, some toward ancient Rome. The representative works of the former class are dialogues: *De Contemptu Mundi*; *De Remediis Utriusque Fortunae*, mediæval in form and conception at least; *De Vita Solitaria*; and *De Otio Religiosorum*. The works which are inspired entirely by the classical or Renaissance spirit are the *Rerum Memorandarum Libri*: *De Viris Illustribus Vitae*, of which there is also an epitome by Petrarch; most of his letters, and the Latin poems—the epic *Africa*, the *Eclogues*, and the *Epistles*.

The dialogue *De Contemptu Mundi* is the most important of those works which are, in a sense, farewell words to the Middle Ages. Theoretically Petrarch still professed to believe in the mediæval ideal of life as something to be devoted solely and entirely to a preparation for the world to come. When this conception was carried out to its ultimate consequences with the relentless logic of the schoolmen, and by a mind tinctured with mediæval ideals, it led to a theory of living wholly antagonistic to humanism. The dialogue is a defense of this one phase of scholasticism; but it is the scholasticism of the heart, not that of the head, that appeals to Petrarch. We can premise also that, whatever the theoretical conclusions of the work, monkish self-abnegation and intellectual as well as physical asceticism had probably as little practical influence upon Petrarch's life as it has on ours.*

* Cook.

The dialogue opens with an account of *Veritas*, who appears to Petrarch when he is in doubt and perplexity as to the meaning of the obligations of life, much as *Philosophia* did to Boethius : *Attonito mihi quidem, et saepissime cogitanti, qualiter in hanc vitam intrassem, qualiterve forem egressurus, contigit nuper ut, non sicut aegros animos solet somnus opprimere, sed anxium atque pervigilem, mulier quaedam innarabilis claritatis et luminis, formaque non satis ab hominibus intellecta—incertum quibus viis adisse videretur, virginem, tamen et habitus nuntiabat et facies—me stupentem insuetæ lucis aspectu et adversus radios quos oculorum eius sol fundebat non audentem oculos ottollere, sic loqueretur.* After a brief conversation she introduces to him Augustine as his spiritual guide, who is to relieve him from his perplexities and explain away his doubts. The three days' conversation with Augustine is given in the three books of the dialogue.

The proposition, "*ad contemnendas huius vitæ illecebras componendumque inter tot mundi procellas animum nihil efficacius reperiri quam memoriam propriæ miseriæ et meditationem mortis assiduam*," forms the key note to Augustine's argument. Next to this *meditationem mortis humanæque miseriæ* comes *desiderium vehemens studiumque surgendi* as a means to salvation. That these two principles are consistently supported throughout is the important thing about this book. We do not find such religious seriousness in Poggio or Valla or Politian ; nor do these men appear to have had spiritual experiences like Plutarch's. Partly, no doubt, this was because the men themselves were different. But this was not all. Beneath all the dialectics and speculation of the Middle Ages there ran in nobler minds a strong current of faith and spiritual experience which was quite foreign to the Renaissance. Petrarch had had this experience, but in him enlightenment had transformed what might have been a fog of superstition in another person and in a darker age into an ethereal haze of mysticism. His poetical imagination idealized his self-communion into a spiritual relationship between himself and his father confessor, Augustine, analogous to the equally ideal romantic relationship existing between himself and Laura.

But while the spirit of the book may be partly mediaeval, Petrarch does not fail to aim a shaft at scholasticism, "*Dialectorum garrulitas, nullum finem habitura.*" He erroneously attributes to Cicero a passage from the first epistle of Seneca, perhaps the only instance of such an error in his works. In the second dialogue there is a rather fine description of Petrarch's life at Vacluse :

Meministi quanta cum voluptate reposito quondam rure vagabaris, et nunc herboris pratorum toris accumbans, murmur aquæ luctantis hauriebas ; nunc apertis collibus residens, subiectam planitiem libero metiebaris intuitu ; nunc in apricæ vallis umbraculo, dulci sopore correptus, optato silentio fruebaris ; nunquam otiosus mente, aliquid altum semper agitans, et solis Musis comitantibus nusquam solus, denique Vergilianî senis exemplo,—

*Qui regem æquabat opes animo, seraque revertens
Nocte domum dapibus mensas onerabat inemptas ;*

sub occasum solis angustam domum repetens, et tuis contentus bonis, numquid non tibi omnium mortalium longe ditissimus et plane felicissimus videbaris ?

For Augustine, who here represents the ideals of mediaeval asceticism, literary pursuits are but *inanis gloriæ lenocinium*, and to Petrarch, still reluctant to sacri-

fice them, even for his soul's sake, he says: *Quo pede claudices agnosco. Te ipsum derelinquere mavis quam libellos tuos.—Abice ingentes historiarum sarcinas, satis Romanae res gestae, et suapte fama et aliorum ingeniis lustratae sunt. Dimitte Africam, eamque possessoribus suis linque, Nec Scipioni tuo nec tibi gloriam cumulabis; ille altius nequit extolli, tu post eum obliquo calle niteris. His igitur posthabitis, te tandem tibi restitue. Incipe tecum de morte cogitare, cui sensim et nescius appropinquas.*

Petrarch continued his studies and literary labors with undiminished ardor, however, after the publication of this work. Asceticism was a theory with him, not a practice.

De Remediis Utriusque Fortunae shows mediaeval influence in its form more than in its content. The work is in two books, as its title suggests, and consists of over two hundred and fifty dialogues. The characters are allegorical, like those of the morality plays or the Middle Age theological dialogues, and the work is utterly devoid of any suggestion of dramatic variety and expression. In the first book *Ratio*, the principal interlocutor, tempers the undue elation of *Gaudium* and *Spes* with wise reflections upon the uncertainty of fortune and the evils attending prosperity; in the second she comforts *Dolor* with rather conventional commonplaces upon the lessons to be learned from adversity and the compensations that accompany misfortunes. There is a sort of a well worn, *locus classicus* atmosphere about the ethics and philosophy of the work that reminds one a little of Pope, though, of course, in form and finish it falls far below anything that the latter writer ever published. The burden of conversation falls upon *Ratio*, the part of the other characters being confined in most cases to a repetition in more or less varying form of the statement that forms the theme of the dialogue. Though the method of treatment is monotonous in the extreme, there is the utmost variety of subject. *Ratio* is called upon to temper the self-congratulation of *Gaudium* over fast horses, success at play, the possession of fish ponds, a beautiful wife, noble birth, many books, wealth, glory, power, literary fame, on the one hand, while she consoles *Dolor* for poverty, illness, domestic calamity or infelicity, exile, or the toothache on the other. In fact, like some country stores, the work might be called a universal emporium, intended to supply all the needs that practical, every day life could make upon it. So catholic was the character of its philosophy that it was supposed to afford solace even in such humble maladies as the rheumatism and the colic, if we may so translate *dolor iliacus*. Perhaps Petrarch's feud with the physicians accounts in part for this.

Besides its form, there is also an occasional tincture of mediaevalism in the very matter of the book itself. When this monkish attitude appears, there is an inconsistent exaggeration about it, as if the author had suddenly bethought himself of the seemliness of being pious, and was making up for past neglect. To us, and probably to the humanists as well, there would appear to be a touch of affectation and cant in such passages as the following:

Gaudium.—*Cantu delector ac fidibus.*

Ratio.—*Ah quanto melius lacrimis atque suspiriis! Praestat enim flendo ad gaudium, quam gaudendo ad gemitum pervenire.*

But Petrarch forgets himself a moment later in a string of classical anecdotes touching upon music, from his *index rerum*: Arion, Themistocles, Epanimondas,

Alcibiades and Nero are brought upon the stage before he recollects himself and closes with: *O si audires sanctorum suspira! O si hinc aures tuas damnatorum gemitus et lamenta percellerent! Hinc beatorum iubilus, et cantus angelici, atque illa caelestis harmonia, quam Pythagoras ponit, Aristoteles evertit, Cicero instaurat, etc.*

De Otio Religiosorum is a work addressed to the monks of Montrieu, where Petrarch had been entertained when upon a visit to his brother, who had entered the Carthusian order. The words of the Psalm, *Vacate et Videte*,* form the text of what is really a eulogy of monastic life as Petrarch conceived it, a life of ease and retirement devoted to religious meditation. The inmate of the cloister is happier than the sailor, the soldier, the merchant, the husbandman, the craftsman, or even the student: *Non praecipitur ut pugnetis, ut navigetis, ut aretis, ut ambuletis, ut congregetis aurum, famam, litteras inanes—instrumenta libidinum, nocitura, pestifera sunt haec.* This is all more or less sincere. It is probable that Petrarch, however actual experience might have changed his views upon the subject. often seriously fancied a monastic life. Vacluse itself was a sort of a hermitage. He once proposed to a number of friends to found for themselves a humanistic cloister in some Italian city, where the Muses could be cultivated undisturbed by the constant religious and political turmoil that distracted Italy.† A tragedy that itself illustrated the lawlessness of the times put an end to these plans.‡ But they show what a strong hold mediaeval ideals still had on Petrarch's mind. The vagrant, anti-cloistral spirit that we have seen anticipated in the Goliards, was one of the characteristics of the humanists. We see how strong the itinerant instinct was in Petrarch himself, and in Erasmus; but to both these men the reaction, the desire for tranquil retirement often came. Petrarch did not know that he was drawing the curtain of a new era. Though he appreciated fully his own importance in the contemporary world, and hoped that posterity would continue to recognize it, he was not conscious of his position in the history of European culture, of the fact that in him were focussed enough of those rays of ancient thought that had pierced the mediaeval darkness to kindle again the fires of learning. He never saw the Petrarch that we see, and the responsibility of his position as the great protagos of humanism was not impressed upon him. He was not a partisan, because the fission of the old from the new was taking place in his own being; part of him was ever yearning to return to the mother organism of mediaeval culture, part was striving continually to free itself from the limitations which that culture imposed. The continuity of history was not broken. For that reason, Petrarch neither drew the sharp line between pagan and Christian writers that the orthodox scholars of the Middle Ages had drawn, nor did he yield entire homage to the authors of antiquity like those who came after him. Cicero and Augustine stand upon the same pedestal. In the work just mentioned Petrarch cites, besides the great orator, Vergil and Juvenal, the younger Pliny, Varro, and Horace, drawing from all arguments in favor of a monastic life. In *De Vita Solitaria* a long list of

* Vulgate, Psalms, 45, 11.

† Cf. Ep. Fam., VIII., 4 and 5.

‡ Mainardo Accursio, an intimate friend whom Petrarch wished to associate with him in this undertaking, was killed by bandits while journeying through the Appenines. A few years later, during his absence however, Petrarch's house at Vacluse was plundered and burned by robbers.

pagans, from Romulus and Numa to the emperors, are cited along with the early saints and fathers of the church among those who have preferred retirement and private meditation to the companionship of their fellow men.

But solitude does not mean with Petrarch the listless, indolent solitude, the purely sensual solitude of the illiterate monk or hermit, who exists through a life of intellectual lethargy, confined within the little circle of his own narrow personal experience or his morbid imagination. Solitude is communion with the great without the distraction of physical companionship. Like all good things it becomes the worst of things when perverted. Books, letters, lofty thinking, are the food that make it a condition for mental or moral growth; it must be active, as well as passive, productive as well as receptive.

This distinction occurs frequently in Petrarch's writings. It forms the opening paragraph of the *Rerum Memorandarum Libri*. Again, in the *Vita Solitaria*; *Solitudo sine litteris exilium est, carcer*;—*adhibite litteras, patria est, libertas, delectatio*. '*Otium sine litteris mors est, et vera sepultura.*' This was not the ideal of Benedict or Bernard. The humanist shares with the monk even this part of Petrarch's nature.

Finally, Petrarch's attitude toward women is rendered contradictory by the strong hold that mediæval ideals had taken upon his soul. He was by nature a lyricist, a poet of emotion, an idealizer of women. We involuntarily mention Petrarch and Laura in the same breath. Yet he wrote, not once, but often, such passages as the following:

Adam publicus ille parens generis humani, quamdiu solus fuit nemo felicior, mox ut comitatus nemo miserior; solus stetit, comitatus ruit; solus beatæ civis patriæ, comitatus infelicis exilii peregrinus; solus in requie et gaudio, comitatus in laboribus et doloribus multis. Denique solus immortalis fuerat; iunge sociam, mortalis efficitur. Iam hinc clarum, et insigne præsaigium quid de societate feminea sperare posteritas deberet. And again he says: *Nullum viris adeo pestiferum ut muliebri consortium. Raro sub eodem tecto habitant quies et mulier.* Of course Seneca was responsible for some of Petrarch's views regarding solitude and the society of women; but from whatever source he derived his opinions, his attitude toward society and the world in general was in very many respects monkish. The two great champions of mediævalism were the monks and the schoolmen. Against the latter only did Petrarch direct his attacks. The former were reserved for a later generation of humanists.

As a rule the letters of a New Latin writer are his most interesting productions. Not only was epistolography an art cultivated with great care by the humanists, but with them letters took the place, to a great extent, of modern periodical literature. The volume of correspondence at this period was proportionately large. What was written was written for publication, with the finish and care that was to be expected in writings that were to be subjected to the scrutinizing criticism, not only of contemporary scholars but of posterity as well. Petrarch, after destroying perhaps the major part of the copies of letters in his possession—*mille vel eo amplius*—edited his familiar epistles in twenty-four books. A later collection, the letters of his old age, contained seventeen books. Besides these we have a collection of miscellaneous letters, and an *Epistolarum sine Titulo Liber*, which contains correspondence dealing with ecclesiastical matters.

Some of these letters are really essays. One contains a commentary upon his Dialogues ; * another, † *De Republica Optime Administranda*, is a short political tractate ; another gives a Latin version of the tale of Griselda, which is found in Boccaccio. ‡ In the twenty-four books of the *Epistolae de Rebus Familiaribus* are a number of letters *Ad viros illustres veteres*, which suggest in their conception, though rather remotely perhaps, Landor's Imaginary Conversations. The third epistle of this book, in which he reproves Cicero for those weaknesses in the character of the great orator learned through the letters to Atticus, Brutus, and Quintus, recently discovered in the cathedral library at Verona, is interesting as showing a moral independence on the part of Petrarch that was not shaken by his admiration of Cicero as a writer.

No single letter is more intrinsically interesting in its contents, or affords a better example of the genial grace of style and treatment that was characteristic of Petrarch in this sphere of writing, than the account of the ascent of Mont Venteux, in the fourth book of the *Familiars*. This is not only an important contribution to Petrarch's psychic biography, as recording a portion of the soul travail that attended the birth of modern conceptions and ideals and criteria of conscience in him ; but it also is perhaps the first instance in Latin literature of a spiritual experience called forth expressly by a sublime natural environment. § In fact, Petrarch can think of but one precedent for ascending a mountain at all, and that a dubious one from Pliny, from which he gained courage, however, in carrying out what seems to have been an original suggestion. With his younger brother for a companion he sallies forth *statuta die*, and arrives at the northern base of the mountain about evening. *Illic unum diem morati, hodie tandem cum singulis famulis montem ascendimus, non sine multa difficultate. Est enim praerupta et paene inaccessibilis saxosae telluris moles. Sed bene a poeta dictum est ;*

Labor omnia vincit improbus

Dies longa, blandus aer, animorum vigor, corporum robur ac dexteritas, et si qua sunt eiusmodi, euntibus aderant. Sola nobis obstat natura loci. They come upon an aged shepherd in the lower valley who tries to dissuade them from their attempt. He had made the ascent fifty years before, and seems to have brought back nothing from his experience but a vivid recollection of body and clothing torn by the rocks and briars. Their youthful ardor, however, is only fired by the difficulties. Leaving their unnecessary baggage with the old peasant, they begin the ascent with the eagerness of tiros. There is something quite modern in their experience, — *alacresque conscendimus. Sed, ut fere fit, — ingentem conatum velox fatigatio subsequitur. Non procul inde igitur quadem in rupe subsistimus. Inde iterum digressi provehimur, sed lentius, et praesertim ego montanum iter gressu iam modestiore carpebam.* Petrarch himself manifests a decided preference for long about, gentle ascents, which generally end by bringing him no nearer to the summit than he was at first ; while his younger brother, with boyish agility, braves the difficult

* Ep. Fam., X., 4.

† Ep. Sen., XIV., 1.

‡ Petrarch thought he was doing his friend a great favor in thus immortalizing his tale. Cf. Ep. Sen., XVII., 3.

§ Perhaps we should except again St. Bernard.

places at once and has the satisfaction of laughing at the baffled poet from some higher eminence. At length they come to the final ascent. *Collis est omnium supremus, quam silvestres filiolum vocant, cur ignoro; nisi quod per antiphrasim, ut quaedam alia dici suspicor. Videtur enim vere pater omnium vicinorum montium. Illius in vertice planities parva est. Illic demum fessi conquevimus. Primum omnium spiritu quodam aeris insolito, et spectaculo liberiore permotus, stupenti similis steti. Respicio; nubes erant sub pedibus. Iamque mihi minus incredibilis facti sunt Athos et Olympus, dum quod de illis audieram et legerem in minoris famae monte conspicio. Dirigo dehinc oculorum radios ad partes Italicas, quo magis inclinat animus. Alpes ipsae rigentes ac nivosae, per quas ferus ille quondam hostis Romani nominis transiit, aceto—si famae credimus—saxa per-rumpens, iuxta mihi visae sunt, cum tam magno distent intervallo. The place, the sublimity of the view suggest to Petrarch the sublimity of life itself, and his own mental and spiritual experience during the ten years since he left Bologna and his youthful studies. At length he is recalled to himself by the advancing shadow and the declining sun. *Et velut expergefactus verto me in tergum ad occidentem respiciens. Limes ille Galliarum et Hispaniae, Pyrenaeus vertex inde non cernitur; nullius quem sciam obicis interventu, sed sola fragilitate mortalitis visus.* (We must remember that this was before Columbus' time.) *Lugdunensis autem provinciae montes ad dextram, ad laevam vero Massiliae fretum et quod Aquas Mortuas verberat aliquot dierum spatia distantia praeclarissime videbantur. Rhodanus ipse sub oculis nostris erat.**

But a book must share the sway of nature with Petrarch. He had brought with him a copy of Augustine's Confessions, a sort of pocket edition *perexigui voluminis, sed infinitae dulcedinis.* Opening it, his eyes, by chance, it seems, happen to fall upon the passage: *Et eunt homines admirari alta montium, et ingentes fluctus maris, et latissimos lapsus fluminum, et Oceani ambitum, et gyros siderum, et relinquunt se ipsos.* The ancient, the mediaeval man had spoken. *Iratus mihimet quod nunc etiam terrestria mirarer, qui iam pridem ab ipsis gentium philosophis discere debuissem, nihil praeter animum esse mirabile in me ipsum interiores oculos reflexi; et ex illa hora non fuit qui me loquentem audiret, donec ad ima pervenimus.—Hos inter nudos pectoris motus sine sensu scrupulosi tramitis ad illud hospitium rusticum, unde ante lucem moverem, profunda nocte remeavi; et luna pernox gratum obsequium praestabat euntibus. Interim ergo, dum famulos apparandae cenae studium exerceret, solus ego in partem domus additam perrexi, haec tibi raptim ex tempore scripturus, ne, si distulissem, pro varietate locorum mutatis forsitan affectibus, scribendi propositum deferret.*

In Petrarch's time historical writing could mean little else than compilation, especially when the theme was the history of an ancient people. Scientific historical criticism was unknown. Petrarch did not have sufficient knowledge of Greek to consult authorities in that language; of the Latin historians known to us only a portion were attainable by him, and that in unindexed and corrupted manuscripts; he had neither the disposition nor the training to enable him to consult intelligently such original documents as might be accessible—inscriptions, ruins, works of art, or other archaeological remains. These latter might serve as a source of inspiration to him, but they never could serve as a source of instruction.

However Petrarch did a great service to the contemporary literary world in this department of letters. The Books of Memorable Things and Lives of Illustrious Men might almost be said to have founded modern European prose. The latter work was the more important of the two, partly because it supplied a real intellectual need at the time it was written, partly because Petrarch put part of himself into his biographies, threw in personal sympathies and sentiments that are sometimes lacking in his other works, but give a touch of individuality to this one that raises it a degree above the later compilations of the Roman period as a piece of literature, despite the faultiness of the language. Petrarch collected and compared with such critical acumen as he could muster all the notices of the men whose lives formed the subject of his work that antiquity had handed down to him, and he embodied them in the best prose that had been written since the beginning of the barbarian invasions. But his literary service did not end here. The lives of these illustrious men are the lives of Petrarch's saints; he writes them with inspiration. His mental attitude towards the work and toward those whom he describes in it is as different from that of a mere compiler as his Latin is different from that pale photograph of classicism that we get in the *Viri Romae*. His purpose was *nec tamen verba transcribere, sed res ipsas*, selecting more especially those things which *ad virtutes vel virtutum contraria trahi possunt*. The lives vary in length from a few pages to a good-sized volume, like that of Caesar. Of the thirty-one biographies only two, those of Alexander and Hannibal, have to do with other than Romans. The work was very popular, was epitomized by Petrarch himself, and was translated into Italian by Donato degli Albazani, one of Petrarch's friends. These latter two facts probably help to explain how the fuller biography of Caesar was so far forgotten in its Latin form as to be mistaken for a work of Celsus.

The style of this work, which represents Petrarch's best prose, can be illustrated most satisfactorily perhaps by an extract. The following is from the twenty-seventh chapter of the life of Caesar:

Ibi cum assidisset, coniurati eum sub praetextu obsequii circumstant; cum Cimber Tullius, qui primas sibi facinoris partes assumpserat, accedens nescio quid poposcit. Neganti in praesens inque aliud tempus rem trahenti ab utroque humero togam manibus arripit. Exclamantem, "Ista quidem vis est," Cassius intra iugulum vulnerat. Caesar, Cassii pugione arrepto brachioque eius traiecto, dum assurgeret alio vulnere remoratus est, quod unum ex omnibus letale medici dixerunt. Sed ad unam vitam finiendam tale vulnus unum satis est. Tum se undique ab omnibus stricto ferro peti videns, neque soli inter tantos et inermi quicquam auxilii superesse intellegens, spiritum recollegit, ne quid indecorum moriens diceret aut faceret; neque omnino aliquid dixit, nisi quod ad primum vulnus parumper infremuit, nulla voce tamen emissa; et Marco Bruto in se irruenti Graecum fertur nescio quid breve dixisse, de quo Caesarem ipsum dicere solitum refert Cicero epistolarum ad Atticum libro decimo: "Magni refert quid hic velit"; sed quicquid volet, valde volet." Et ipse quidem in extremo toga caput obnubit, laevaque sinum vestimenti ad inferiores corporis partes extendit, quo casus esset honestior. Ita ille, qui tot terras primum, post in urbe Roma terrarum orbem mira felicitate subegerat, una hora tribus et viginti vulneribus ad terram datus occubuit, inque omnem terram auditus est ruinae fragor ingentis.

The *Africa* was Petrarch's most pretentious work, the one upon which he based his hopes of permanent fame, and also perhaps the one in which he most completely failed. According to ancient ideals the heroic epic represented the highest possible literary achievement, and it was therefore the natural goal of Petrarch's ambition as a poet. All through his works references to the poem occur, either echoes of its theme and episodes, or gossip allusions to his progress in its composition. The absolute faith in Petrarch and in the permanent revival of Latin that prevailed among the first generation of humanists caused many to expect a work that was to rank with the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* among the great, immortal masterpieces of literature. But long before Petrarch's death and the publication of the partially completed poem, from a fragment which had been made known to them, and possibly, too, from inspection on the part of intimate friends, the better judgment of the Florentine critics led them to revise their preconceived opinion of the future work, and to appreciate the limitations which the genius of the poet at least, if not his time and literary tongue, placed upon it. Petrarch himself probably felt conscious of these limitations so far as they concerned himself alone. But it is doubtful whether he ever realized the universal impossibility of a new Latin epic. As a lyric songster he was hardly capable of the lofty and sustained flight of epic verse, and as a result the *Africa* is a sort of a flitting from tree to tree, a series of attractive, interesting, sometimes emotional episodes, which seldom rise to the sublime.

The theme of the *Africa* is the story of the elder Africanus, in the second Punic war. The poem opens, after an invocation to the Muses and a dedication to King Robert of Sicily, with a brief review of the wars between Carthage and Rome; Hasdrubal has just been summoned to Italy by Hannibal, and Scipio, now master of Spain, pauses uncertain where next to turn his arms. His father appears to him in a vision and discloses what the fates have in store for him and his country. This dream occupies the remainder of the first and all of the second book. The third and a portion of the fourth book describe the embassy of Laelius at the court of Syphax, closing with the former's eulogy of Scipio at a banquet in the palace. These books subserve the same purpose as the second and third of the *Aeneid*, enabling the Roman guest to relate to his Numidian host the former exploits of the Romans and the biography of the hero of the poem. There is now a lacuna of over three books, constituting the unfinished portion of the poem, and the narrative reopens with the infatuation of Massinissa for Sophonisbe, the wife of Syphax, whom he has just captured after defeating her husband in battle. He secretly marries his beautiful captive; but Scipio demands that she be delivered to the Romans, and her husband in despair sends her poison. The sixth book, as at present numbered, opens with the appearance of Sophonisbe in the lower world—She is the Dido of the *Africa*, but perhaps a more lovable, winning character than the Carthaginian queen—where she becomes the companion of those unfortunate in love. The remainder of the book is taken up with the triumph of Massinissa, Laelius' return to Rome with the Carthaginian prisoners, the first negotiations for peace, and Hannibal's return to Carthage. It closes with the death of Mago while returning from Italy. The two following books describe the subsequent successes of Scipio, the battle of Zama, and the conclusion of peace. The last book contains an account of the return of Scipio and his triumph, the last fifty lines be-

ing devoted to a lament over the death of Robert, and a rather depressng admonition to the Muses to avoid appearing in Italy during the troublous times under which she was laboring.

Vergil is Petrarch's master in the construction of the *Africa*, very much in the same way that Homer was Vergil's master in the composition of the *Aeneid*. The character of the influence was similar though the result was, naturally, different; for Vergil was writing under conditions favorable for the production of a great poem, Petrarch was not. Though, as we have seen, the Italians of Petrarch's time looked upon Roman history as their own, and the *Africa* was written in response to this sentiment, both the theme and the language were too remote from the life of the people to make the poem really a national one. Petrarch's relation to Vergil is indicated by parallel incidents and parallel modes of expression rather than by the actual appropriation of verses and centos. As an illustration of the first: Syphax, king of Numidia, receives Scipio's ambassador Laelius, who comes to seek an alliance before the invasion of Africa, at a magnificent banquet, the description and incidents of which are evidently modeled upon the account of the reception of Aeneas by Dido. A minstrel sings the legends of Hercules, Atlas and Perseus, and the founding of Carthage, closing with an epilogue glorifying Hannibal and Scipio, and prophesying the imminent and final contest. Laelius, at the request of Syphax, then recounts the deeds of Roman heroes, of the Decii, Curtius, Regulus, Brutus, and the death of Lucretia. As an example of how the expression sometimes follows Vergil without exactly borrowing a cento from him—a peculiarity already noticed in Petrarch's Latin—in the prelude to his account of the Romans, Laelius says:

breviter nostros audire triumphos
Forte putas; brevior narrantibus exeat annus,

There is nothing just like this, we believe, in the *Aeneid*. But still it suggests:

casus cognoscere nostros,
Et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem;

and:

Et vacet annalis nostrorum audire laborum;
Ante diem clauso componat vesper Olympo.

There is just a half suggestion of the leonine rhyme in both of the last two lines quoted that may have helped to justify in Petrarch's mind the use of the full leonines that he occasionally weaves into his Latin verse, as we shall have occasion to note below.

Laelius' narrative also contains a fine characterization of the Romans, a really grand expression of the Stoic ideal, that makes the passage worthy to be compared with the famous *Tu regere imperio* of the *Aeneid*:

Romanum est, si nescis, opus contemnere casus
Fortuitos, placide venienti occurrere morti:
Spernere quae gentes aliae mirantur et optant,
Contra autem amplecti quae formidanda videntur;
Vincere supplicia et tristes calcare dolores,
Sponte mori potius quam turpem degere vitam.

The farewell of Massinissa to Sophonisbe possesses more dramatic truth, is more sincere from the emotional point of view, than any other episode in the poem. The whole passage is too long for quotation, yet it should be read entire in order to do justice to a part :

Cara mihi nimium, vita mihi dulcior omni,
Sophonisba vale. Non te, mea cara, videbo
Leniter aetherios posthac componere vultus,
Effusosque auro religantem ex more capillos;
Dulcia non caelum mulcentia verba deosque
Oris odorati secretaque murmura carpam.
Solutus ero, gelidoque insternam membra cubili.

Toward the close, as he reads the tender last farewell in the eyes of his bride, there are two leonines brought in almost with the touch of inspiration :

Lumina magnorum mentes tractura deorum,
Lumina durorum rabiem fractura virorum.

To an ear accustomed to the rhyme there is something of the majestic, solemn threnody of the dirge about them.

The *Africa* was a mistake, but it was the mistake of a genius. Only now and then does it rise high enough to give us a passing glimpse of what must have been the ideal in the mind of the poet. It is like the ruins of a half completed building, where the architect had brought together noble marbles and sculpture, and had begun to work out beautiful pieces of detail, but where there was a radical defect in the plan or the means at the builder's disposal that rendered the completion of the whole impracticable. It is doubtful whether Petrarch ever fully realized this. There certainly were times when he imagined himself walking with the two or three immortal masters of epic verse. In the second book of the *Africa* there is a passage where the elder Scipio gives his son a sort of prophetic epitome of his own future history and that of the Republic, modelled evidently upon the prophecy of Anchises in the sixth book of the *Aeneid* : Two bards shall herald the glory of the son, the contemporary Ennius, and another who is to appear in a distant generation :

Cernere iam videor genitum post saecula multa
Finibus Etruscis iuvenem, qui gesta renarret,
Nate, tua ; et nobis veniat velut Ennius alter ;
Carus uterque mihi, studio memorandus uterque.
Iste rudes Latio duro modulamine Musas
Intulit, ille autem fugientes carmine sistet.

In one sense Petrarch's position in Latin literature was as important as he imagined it to be. It was he more than any other who recalled the fleeing Muses to Italy and re-established learning in its old seats. But he was not to do this through any single masterpiece. In this respect he was the opposite of Dante. The earlier poet by one work of surpassing excellence established for himself an enduring place in Italian literature and for Italian literature an enduring place in the literature of the world. The later, though he left no work that was to com-

mand the undivided attention of posterity, exercised an influence through a thousand devious channels that makes his position in the history of world culture perhaps even greater than that of Dante.

With the possible exceptions of the more labored portions of the *Africa*, Petrarch's *Eclogues* give the least evidence of poetic inspiration of anything that he ever wrote in verse. It is difficult to see where he made any very essential advance beyond Dante in this branch of Latin composition. The allegorical signification of the poems was too recondite to be understood without a commentary—*Genus est quod, nisi ex eo ipso qui condidit auditum, intelligi non potest*—as the author himself confesses. They were not the work of his maturest years, and possibly for that reason savor a little of the school room; there is something a trifle scholastic about them. We are more than once informed, also, that they were written with incredible rapidity.*

There are twelve of the *Eclogues*, six of them dealing with contemporary political questions, one, the ninth, with the plague of 1348, and the others with matters of a more or less personal and private character. The tenth contains a long roll call of those writers of antiquity with whom Petrarch was either directly or indirectly familiar. In the fourth there are several passages in praise of poesy, some of which show Petrarch at his best in this sort of writing :

Citharae solatia nescis ;
Rem magnam, si nota, voces. Fastidia mulcet ;
Laxatos animos refovet ; solatur amicos ;
Gaudia restituit ; pellit de pectore luctum ;
Exsiccat lacrimas ; compescit flebile murmur ;
Spem revehit, frangitque metum, vultumque serenat.

There is a passage in the tenth *Eclogue* that illustrates to what extent his love for Laura was in Petrarch's mind always more or less a sensual image of his devotion to the Muses. Laura was the Virgin Mary of his humanistic cult. A laurel tree typifies both Laura and poetry in the following :

Fuit alta remotis
Silva locis, qua se diversis montibus acti
Sorgans, nitens Rhodano, pallensque Ruentia miscent.
Hic mihi, quo fueram Tusco translatus ab Arno,
(Sic hominum res fata rotant) fuit aridulus rus ;
Dum colui, indigui, atque operi successit egestas.
Id reputans—avertor enim—piguitque laborum
Pertaesumque inopis studii, tandemque, relinquens
Arva inarata, vagus silvis spatiabar apricis.
Verum inter scopulos, nodosaque robora quercus
Creverat ad ripam fluvii pulcherrima Laurus.
Huc rapior, dulcisque semel postquam attigit umbra,
Omnis in hanc vertor ; cessit mea prima voluptas.

* *Totum Bucolicum carmen absolvi, quam breve dierum spatio sinoris, stupeas*, Ep. Fam., VIII., 3 ; *incredibile est quam paucis diebus solverim*, Ep. Fam., X., 4.

There was a brief period, while the aceticism of the Middle Ages was disappearing but its spiritual ideals still exercised a patent influence over minds of the nobler sort, when love—of a higher type than that of the Roman poets—seems to have been the dominating influence in determining the form through which literary inspiration sought its concrete expression. Beatrice and Laura—possibly even the Fiametta of Boccaccio—inspired a passion of this sort, a passion altogether higher and purer than that of the Latin lyricists which ultimately drew down to its own level the later erotic poetry of the Renaissance.

In closing the consideration of Petrarch's Latin poems with the Epistles we can say what has already been intimated in case of the prose letters, that in this sphere of literature we see more than anywhere else the genial, lovable Petrarch, who exercised a wider influence, perhaps, through his personality than through his writings. The Latin catches something of the spirit of the author in these letters, and follows the thought with the simple, meandering ease with which a brook follows its course down a valley. We seldom stop either to admire or to criticise the style, but are merely conscious of a pleasing effect, without our attention being called to the means by which it is produced.

Some of these letters are very modest in their conception.* There is one to his trees that quite reminds you of Bryant. Some have a patriotic inspiration. Others deal with the simplest details of Petrarch's domestic life. There are none of the sixty-seven poetical epistles that are not worth reading, a statement that could hardly be made of any other equally voluminous body of Latin poems written since the classic age.

Many of the letters deal with much graver subjects than the one from which the following quotations have been taken, and would perhaps be in a way more brilliant illustrations of Petrarch's style in writing of this kind; but there is quite as much that is representative of the qualities that make the letters interesting in the following as in any of the others. One sees that neither the subject nor the treatment is very ambitious, but he is nevertheless pleased with the unceremonious familiarity of it all. The letter is to the Cardinal Giovanni di Colonna, thanking him for a pet dog that he had recently sent to be the poet's companion in the solitude of Vaucluse.

Solamen comitemque viae largiris; at ille,
 Sublim de sede licet venturus ad imas,
 Paret et iniectis maestus dat colla catenis;
 Et sequitur, nec spernit heri mandata minoris.
 Paulatim minus atque minus meminisse relictas
 Delicias, iam prata iuvant, iam lucida tranans
 Flumina mordet aquas, luditque in gurgite puro.
 Fercula iam sibi nostra placent et libera curis
 Otia; deserti non ampla palatia regis

*It is in the metrical epistles that we have the well known praise of books, Lib. I., Ep. 7:

*Illustres nec difficiles, quibus angulus unus,
 Aedibus in modicis satis est, qui nulla recessant
 Imperia, assidueque adsint et taedia nunquam
 Ulla ferunt abeant iussi redeantque vocati.*

Anteferat variasque dapes ; iam panis et unda
 Sufficiunt, et parva domus.
 Excubat ante foras. Quotiens me longior aequo
 Somnium habet fessum, queritur solisque reversi
 Admonet increpitans et concutit ostia plantis.
 Illicet egressum vultu plaudante salutat,
 Meque praeit, loca nota petens, et lumina volvens.

It is not our intention to enter upon an extended discussion of the Latinity of Petrarch.* He lived before any critical study of Latin had been made, before the existence of printed books, when indices and lexicons and the other practical aids to classical scholarship were as yet a thing of the future. It is not strange, then, that his Latin is more or less empirical, that of a masterly imitator rather than of a critical scholar. On the other hand there is much true, living vitality in it also. His word order is more classical and his sentence structure more Ciceronian than that of many of the more correct writers who followed him. In the broad rules of syntax he seldom errs. The subjunctive is used in subordinate clauses and the infinitive in indirect discourse as in classical writers. He occasionally makes slips in the use of the reflexive, or in prepositional and case relations, as the titles of his books—*De Viris Illustribus Vitae*, *Rerum Memorandarum Liber*—suggest. Perhaps his variation from a classical standard is most frequent and noticeable in case of certain idiomatic expressions depending upon the force of an individual word. So we find in the life of Caesar: *quum esset Caesaris intentio in Gallia hibernare*, page 216; *a proximioribus hibernis*, page 224; *C. Trebonii ducatu in castra penetravit*; *Occasio rebellantibus data erat historias novas in Caesarem fingendi*. Sometimes an awkward verse occurs in his poems, as in the *Africa*, where Lucretia says,

Exemploque mei non vivet adulter Romae.

But all this is redeemed by the naturalness and fluency of Petrarch's Latin. It is not, as a rule, stilted or labored, but flows with such grace and ease from his pen that even his errors are often little more than piquant, as if they betrayed carelessness rather than ignorance.

In Petrarch appears, with almost Minerva-like suddenness, the fully developed Latin of the Renaissance. His successors had little else to do than to polish and perfect what he had rediscovered—to wash the earth stains from the statue, so to speak. But he possessed more than he transmitted. He lived before the days of microscopic criticism, and wrote with a freedom and ease that many of the successors lacked. It was ancient life, not ancient forms, that he wanted to bring back, and the contents of his works always governed their expression. In Petrarch, too, the higher elements of mediaeval culture survived, and they gave a certain seriousness and spiritual depth to him as a writer that we look for in vain in those who followed him. His significance in literature and, to some extent, in Latin, is of two sorts. That which depends upon his relation to his age and the events that followed; and that which comes from those personal, individual elements of character seen through his works, which some way have a universal interest, apart from any period, cult or intellectual movement.

*This has already been done very exhaustively by Schneider in his edition of the life of Caesar, a work, however, which I have been unable to consult.

III.

Erasmus is usually seen by the modern observer through the dust of the great religious conflict that was just beginning during the last years of his life. His attitude toward that conflict and the mighty principles that animated it is seen in the light of subsequent events; and for this reason the humanist is often forgotten in the reformer. Yet, if we take that word in the technical sense applied to it in connection with the sixteenth century, Erasmus never was a reformer at all. He was a humanist, and as such was a partisan of the movement that ultimately led to the Reformation. But the sentiment and conviction, the whole spirit that dominated the later movement, was something that remained to the last essentially foreign to him, without the range of his sympathies or his understanding. Even when he is forced at last to take a tardy and half-hearted part in the contest, he exclaims in remonstrance: *Ego—ex cultore Musarum fio gladiator.—Ego semper in campis Musarum versatus, in hanc cruentam pugnam protrudor*.^{*} To the last he sees in the whole disturbance but some sort of an attack upon the liberal arts. It is humanism, his cult, that is being undermined or assaulted. As late as 1529 he writes: *Hic igitur est fons et seminarium huius totius tragoediae, immedicabile odium linguarum et bonarum literarum*.[†] Keen sighted as he was, and conscious as he was of the abuses that existed in the Church, Erasmus never appreciated his own position in the movement that it was to follow, nor the importance that movement was to assume. In this respect he is like Petrarch, a man of two epochs.

Turning aside from the theological arena and confining ourselves to the field of literature alone, the three phenomena that characterize the sixteenth century are wider interpretation and imitation of ancient life, the reform in education, and the founding of vernacular, national literature in northern Europe, with a position equal to that of the ancient tongues. In each one of these three phases of intellectual activity Erasmus took his part, and though, in a rather paradoxical way, our subject is concerned chiefly with the last of them, we shall review briefly the preceding two before proceeding to its further consideration.

At the time of Erasmus' birth the Renaissance spirit had been domiciled south of the Alps for over a century, and it was just beginning to send a vivifying thrill through the scholastic fogs that hung over the northern lands. Erasmus felt the touch of this spirit through the medium of his Deventer master, Alexander Hegius, a pupil of the great Agricola, the apostle of the new learning in Germany. From that time he seems to have owed to himself more than to his teachers, and to have struggled up through all the difficulties of an adverse environment to become, what he undoubtedly was, the first humanist of Europe. It was through letters, rather than his personal experience as a teacher, that he exercised an influence wide enough to entitle him to this distinction. Aside from his brief pedagogical career at the English universities, and his merely perfunctory duties as honorary director of the trilingual school at Louvain, he took no direct part in public instruction. But with the exception of some of his controversial writings, all that he ever wrote bore directly or indirectly upon the restoration of ancient letters. To this pointed his activity as an editor. There is a savor of printer's ink about him stronger than

^{*} Ep., 715, III., 833, F.

[†] Ep., 545, III., 595, C.

the mould of manuscripts, as if, like Franklin or Greely, he had lived within constant sound of the press. At Venice, and later, during the fruitful autumn of his life at Bâle, he was in fact a publisher, the literary head of the greatest press in Europe. Even in his theological works the exegetical character and the philological and culture-history—to use a Germanism—aspect predominates. His letters and all his pedagogical works, more numerous and important than those of any other contemporary writer, and perhaps his greatest single work, the *Adages*, the most important scholarly contribution that had so far been made to modern literature, were all of them but more or less elaborate treatises or weapons in the cause of humanism. In the preface to the *Colloquies* Erasmus expressly states his object in writing them to be to *entice* boys to the study of Latin.

It is interesting for us to-day, when the ancient tongues are usually studied with the scalpel and dissecting knife, to see how the sixteenth century linguist, who secured a real mastery of the two classic languages in the course of his lifetime, would start children out on the highway of learning. Latin, of course, is the foundation and corner-stone of a liberal education. In the matter of method Erasmus' views may have been a little ideal for his time, but they are certainly rational and in line with modern tendencies. He would begin with the object lesson and the literary anecdote.

The child should begin to learn a language early, while the imitative faculty is still strong, and is exercised involuntarily or with actual pleasure, as it is in case of parrots and starlings. It is a good thing in order to get a mastery of a language to be brought up among talkative people. A child learns more readily and thoroughly if the subject discussed is depicted to him in a picture or drawn upon the board. This is true also in learning the names and qualities of trees, plants and animals, especially those that are not common, as, for instance, the elephant or the rhinoceros. Suppose you have on the board an elephant whose fore legs are in the toils of a python. The youngster is at once interested in the new picture. Now what does the teacher do? He explains what the great big animal is called by the Greeks, and that the Latin name is the same, except that it is declined *elephantus, elephanti*. He points out and gives the Greek name for the proboscis, and tells them that the Latins called this the *manus*, because the elephant *hands* itself its food with it. He calls attention to the fact that the elephant does not breathe with its mouth, but with its proboscis, and bids the child note the long tusks, from which we get ivory, at the same time showing an ivory comb. He tells them about the huge Indian serpent called the python, and gives its name in both Greek and Latin. He also explains that there is bitter enmity between the elephant and the python.

Then what is more pleasing than the tales of the poets? Their fables are so delightful to children that they remain with them in after life, not only founding their knowledge of the language, but also teaching them to form sound-judgments, and adding to their store of literary expressions. What does a child hear with more pleasure than Aesop's fables, where moral truths are taught in sport as it were? The same is true of the other stories of the ancient poets. A boy is told about the companions of Ulysses turned into swine and other brutish forms and laughs at the story; but at the same time he gets a glimpse of the fact that men who are not governed by reason, but are carried away by their animal

instincts, are not men, but beasts. And leaving aside for a moment the moral training, think what a true appreciation of the real force of words they thus get, something wonderfully rare even among those famous for their learning to-day. Finally let children learn brief and pithy quotations of the proverbial sort, and the sayings of illustrious men; for these once contained the sum of all philosophy.

In regard to grammar he says: "While I appreciate the necessity of this, I should wish it taught in the least possible compass, and only what is best. I have never approved the common custom of keeping boys grinding at this subject for several years." He would teach Latin and Greek together, making each support the other.

In reading the Latin authors—and reading should commence as soon as possible—Erasmus would begin with Terence, "whose style is pure, terse, colloquial, and whose subjects naturally interest children." One might add if he chose some of the less objectionable comedies of Plautus. Then should come, in the order named, Vergil, Horace, Cicero, and Caesar. One might add Sallust. These authors would suffice for a complete mastery of Latin. Erasmus has no sympathy with those who spend their whole lives in unrolling parchments in order to learn the language, and think no one a Latinist who has let the smallest volume escape him.

This all refers to what we should call preparatory education. Beyond this lies the university training, the mastery of science and philosophy and the professional branches. But meanwhile we must not despise or neglect social education. And especially if one cultivates the acquaintance of learned men, whose daily conversation contains much that is well worth knowing, he will learn many things without much labor. For besides their social chat and their every-day talk he will hear at luncheon perhaps as many as eight of the most brilliant sayings of famous authors quoted or alluded to, and a like number at dinner. Consider what this means for one in the course of a year. Then if one constantly hears good Latin is there any reason why he should not become familiar with the language in a few months to the same extent that illiterate boys do with French or Spanish in an equal time?

Of course, the moral side of education is always emphasized in Erasmus' works. We feel a little less in touch with his way of treating this subject, perhaps; there is a sort of abnormal, Sandford and Merton goodness expected of his boys that really would hardly be desirable in a nineteenth century school in America. In regard to discipline he utters an indignant protest against the brutality of the masters. A generous minded boy should have his spirit cultivated, not broken.

If in the position of a public man in which his scholarly attainments had placed him Erasmus stands at the parting point of the humanists and the reformers, if he feels himself carried way from the Fortunate Isles of literary ease upon a current of thoughts and events which he cannot control, and which seems to be hurrying him out into a boundless sea of intellectual and religious anarchy, he finds himself as an author in a position no less anomalous. As a writer he stands at the boundary of New Latin and the Vernacular literature. His popular works no sooner leave his hands than they don the garb of an unknown tongue and hurry off into channels beyond his control. When Luther meets him with a doc-

trinal tract in German he feels very much—to use Feugère's expression—like an armored knight brought face to face with a musket. The laborers and craftsmen were beginning to discuss theological questions in the taverns, the peasants were rising, a restless spirit of nationality was beginning to assert itself, the first throes of a new era were convulsing society. The influences that were working these changes embraced in their sphere Erasmus and the humanists as well. But they were obliged to overcome in this instance a disciplined resistance that they did not meet in the mere inertia of the masses. Yet, in order to cope successfully with the new questions arising, Latin itself must again, as in the days of the Goliardi, descend from the schools into the street. In such works as the *Colloquies* we see the beginning of a popular New Latin literature, a vernacular Latin so to speak, that failed to attain importance only because it was so soon succeeded by the literature of the native tongues. A more detailed study of this Latinity will not be uninteresting, even if it be only to show how unconsciously and instinctively popular Latin clings to the same distinctive features, whether it be in the hands of a Roman writer or of a Latinist of the Renaissance.

Erasmus was not inspired with the feeling of nationality. He was not a patriot. In weighing the desirability of this land as against another as a place of residence the thought that one is his native country never occurs to him. He is a citizen only of the republic of letters. His own nationality he prefers to leave in doubt. In one letter he says: "I neither assert nor deny that I am a Frenchman; being so born that I can reasonably doubt whether French or German." To another friend who remonstrates with him for his indifference in the matter he says: "It doesn't seem to me to make much difference where a person's born." This sentiment, then, could hardly have been a literary influence with Erasmus.

With reference to his mother tongue, we gather from his letters that he had not entirely forgotten it. He understood it colloquially, but he seems to have had it in no literary command. He refused the position of public reader, voluntarily offered to him at Louvain by the city magistrates, because of his poor command of the language, and he speaks in another place of not writing in Dutch, in correspondence with a friend, because of the difficulties that the language offered. He speaks in one case of having written a letter in bad French, and a colloquial knowledge of the language is implied in his account of an adventure with robbers while travelling from Amiens to Paris. There is a hint in the *Colloquies* of the way he learned this language. We have no reason to suppose, however, that Erasmus could use French in a literary way. We know that he knew neither English nor Italian, even to the extent of carrying on, in those languages, a broken conversation. There is some reason to believe that, probably from its kinship to Dutch, he could read a little German. Of course, Erasmus wrote Greek with some facility, but he learned that language late and his mastery of it was always far from perfect. However, this would have no importance in connection with his writings in any case. As a literary man, therefore, Erasmus was, as he would have said, unilingual. He was confined to Latin. That was the language in which he thought, wrote and passed his life. There is no doubt but that this fact narrowed his sympathies somewhat, and made him less responsive to the popular influences that were the vital element in the world about him. But it

did not exclude them entirely. They acted inductively upon his works and determined the current of feeling in them.

The *Colloquies* might be termed vernacular works in a Latin garb. They are in spirit entirely modern, without a suggestion of antiquity about them. For this reason partly their Latinity is unique, as we shall see later. They to some extent embody, epitomize the Renaissance and the Middle Ages at the same time, but from the point of view of a spectator, not of a participant; and the fact that there is a shimmer of satire or playful mockery over the whole does not lessen the effect of the contrast. Society in Erasmus' time was a rather incongruous medley of enlightenment and ignorance, liberalism and superstition, high ethical ideals and immoral practices—a sort of carnival preceding the lent of the Reformation. It is this society that Erasmus paints in a series of genre pictures, with a Hogarthian touch that heightens the caricature just enough to give point to the moral. It required a master of the language to do this in Latin, and a master of human nature to do it at all.

Erasmus is so intimately associated in our minds with the beginning of the Reformation that we naturally expect him to be directing the shafts of his satire against mediæval superstition and ecclesiastical abuses. And as a matter of fact—though the theological aspect of the *Colloquies* lies beyond the scope of our subject—there is something extremely modern in the way he views and ridicules some of the more obvious inconsistencies in the religious belief and customs of his times. He antedates Mark Twain's story about the cross by over three centuries, in the *Peregrinatio Religionis Ergo*, where he says that it is exhibited publicly and privately in so many places that "if all the fragments were collected in one place they would freight the largest transport. And yet our Lord and master bore his whole cross alone!" And in connection with the milk of the Virgin, often exhibited as a sacred relic, he exclaims: "Oh mother most like unto her son! He left his blood in such abundance. But she has betowed her milk upon the world so lavishly that, even had the babe used none, we could scarce believe it from a woman with a single child."

We probably have a picture from life in the *Funus*, where the bed chamber of the dying officer is filled with the tumult of the members of the four mendicant orders clamoring for a share in the spoils of the estate, and the priest refuses to administer supreme unction because the dying man had previously confessed to a Franciscan. The *virgo poenitens*, who, we are led to infer, had lost her maidenhood in a monastery, the credulous pilgrim who leaves wife and children to perform vows at distant shrines, the sensual abbot who prefers illiterate monks because they don't talk back, and places the pleasures of the table and the chase before those of literature, are but fly-leaf sketches, faces caught from the crowd that buffeted and jostled along the highway of sixteenth century life. And in most cases we feel that there is not much partisanship, much ill-feeling or theological fervor in all this friendly ridicule. It is not the coarse, bitter satire of the Goliard, or the fiery invective of the reformer that we see as a rule. Only occasionally is there an exception, as in the *Mernardus*, where Erasmus had a personal grievance to settle, or now and then in the allusions to the monks, towards whose whole life, habits, and tastes his involuntary attitude, from early childhood, it seems, had been hostile and repugnant.

The side lights upon the culture of the time are beyond numbering; for they pervade a whole work, as they do a modern novel. The recent discovery of America is referred to frequently. The *insulae nuper inventae* had just begun to appeal to the imagination of the people, and to take the place that the Holy Land and the Levant had formerly held as the realm of adventure and unknown possibilities. The spirit of nationality, as we have seen, had become so far developed as to make national customs and characteristics the theme of frequent observation and remark. Sometimes there is a general comparison, as in the *Encomium Moriae*: "The English pride themselves above all things upon their fine personal appearance, music, and a good table; the Scotch upon nobility and relationship to the king, and on account of their skill in dialectic controversies; the French upon their polite manners; the Italians upon their literary culture and eloquence, and especially because they are the only ones in the world who are not barbarians. The Greeks consider themselves the inventors of the sciences, and boast of the heroic deeds of their ancestors; the Spaniards yield to none in martial glory; while the Germans flatter themselves upon their physical stature and delight in the occult arts." In another passage we are told that, "In Italy men salute each other with a kiss, which would seem extremely absurd in Germany, where men shake hands. Again, in England men greet ladies when they meet in church, which would be considered disgraceful in Italy. It is also a mark of attention in England to offer your cup to one coming in at a banquet, while to do the same thing in France would be an insult." France is the land of economy in Erasmus' mind. This is indicated by the scrupulous care of the French to get a dinner in return from every guest whom they entertain. They encourage conversation at the table in order to lessen the consumption of wine. Their preference for pork is attributed to the fact that it is less expensive than other kinds of meat. Their love of flowers is due to their forming an attractive ornament for a scantily covered table. A liardus suffices to purchase them a dinner. At the same time, however, a French inn is an ideal stopping place for a traveller. There you find neatness, courteous attention, and a table whose excellence is only surpassed by its cheapness. Jacobus, in the *Opulenta Sordida*, after being nearly starved by a penurious host in an Italian city, goes to recuperate to a *venustissimum Gallorum contubernium*. Quite different from this is the German inn. There you are received with scant courtesy and few accommodations. You act as your own servant, and are expected to spend your time when indoors in the common living room, where you are packed in with two or three score other guests of all ages and conditions. The temperature of the place is kept so high that you are tempted to believe that the German idea of hospitality is associated some way with a profuse flow of perspiration. If you venture to open a window ever so little there is immediate and universal expostulation on the part of those assembled, and the landlord directs you to carry your heterodox views about fresh air to some other hostelry. You all contribute equally toward purchasing the wine for dinner, and he is the most popular who drinks the most. Cheese abounding in vermin and in the last stages of putrefaction winds up the banquet, and in due course of time you are shown to a bed whose linen was last washed a month before. Then there is the Italian in the *Naufragium*, excitedly invoking curses upon the gods of the upper and lower worlds with tragic gesticulations be-

cause he had entrusted his life and his precious chattels to so "barbarous" an element. It is considered sufficient apology for a dull story to say that it is Dutch. But Erasmus more than once praises the honesty and humanity of his fellow countrymen, though in the letters he chides their contempt or indifference for liberal studies and literature. He evidently looked upon them as good, plodding people of the bovine sort, and rather wondered how his own little, nervous, vivacious self ever grew out of such a boggy environment.

We are often reminded in the *Colloquies* of the fact that four centuries have made a great change in all the more delicate refinements of life in Western Europe. We get an impression that the sixteenth century scholar and priest went around *onusus pediculis*, and even royal magnificence seems to have been like that of the Russian ambassadors at the court of William, who advanced "dropping pearls and vermin at each step." A witticism that is anything but delicate appears in the conversation between a young matron and a gentleman friend at the opening of the *Puerpera*. A still more curious illustration of the broadness of language tolerated by the custom of the time appears in the defense of the *Colloquies*. In the dialogue *Adulescentis et Scorti* Erasmus made the young woman address her former lover as *Mea mentula*. As he prided himself that he had made "the language of the brothel chaste" in this colloquy, his sense of justice is outraged that a few over-prudish critics have found anything indelicate in the word, "a form of address in very common use even among our most respectable matrons."

The tendency to usurp those prerogatives of dress and fashion that had formerly belonged exclusively to the nobility was beginning to appear among the women of the middle class. The goodwife must dress in silk and fine linen and costly furs while her husband mends shoes at home. Pearls are already too common for her use, but she must have more costly gems. Her train is fully as long as my lady's, and if my lady have footmen, she must have not only footmen but pages. Nor will she yield one whit to a dame of the bluest blood at table, though her husband be a tradesman. Even the nobility are so far forgetting themselves as to marry from the lower classes, and a monstrous, hybrid class is thus arising that belongs to neither rank. If this complaint is not Erasmus' own, it is at least put into the mouth of a dame of rank in the *Senatulus*.

Domestic comforts are becoming more common. Glazed windows that turn on hinges in the French style are in general use in private houses, and the master views his orchard and fowl yard from a hammock swung in the gallery. Sanitary precautions are a matter of some concern. Cattle must be slaughtered at proper times and places. Erasmus would discourage the habit of using cups in common, and of sleeping together upon ordinary occasions. Legislation regarding the poor is agitating the thoughts of statesmen—probably England is thought of in this connection. Erasmus' attitude towards women is liberal. He suggests that they should have a voice in choosing a husband for a daughter, and, though more than half jokingly, that they might be entrusted with some of the minor municipal magistracies. On the other hand he does not approve of dame schools, or of women as teachers for boys, as their temper is too uncertain. He does sympathize heartily, however, with what we should call the higher education of women. English and possibly Italian influences had something to do with this. We must

remember that women had taken degree, and taught at Bologna, and Thomas More's daughters had been their father's companions in his studies. The generation of Lady Jane Grey was just appearing upon the scene.

Printing had brought a new sort of vagabonds into the community. The tramp printer seems to have been coeval with the invention of the art itself. There are always starving, "impecunious country editors" to be found ready for any scheme that promises a financial return. They are most convenient tools for the impostor who would secure notoriety or political and social influence by means of the press.

While Erasmus looks upon the people, the *mobile vulgus*, with something like aristocratic reserve, and considers the masses the worst possible adviser in a matter of importance, he is not less exacting upon their rulers for this reason. Upon occasion he satirizes the princes just as keenly as he does the priests. Erasmus' political philosophy seems to have been learned from Aquinas, who always held a rein over his views despite his humanistic antagonism to scholasticism. Scotus, however, receives no mercy at his hands. He is *non fons Musarum, sed lacus ranarum*, and his name is punned with σκότος. Except in some special applications there is always a lurking feeling of hostility toward dialectics and scholasticism in Erasmus' mind that leads him to let a shaft fly at them whenever his subject brings him within range. In full accord with this, his attitude toward the pagan authors is friendly. He does not feel the passionate devotion of Petrarch for the ancient world; his judgment is more mature and critical; but he is inspired with enthusiasm whenever classical antiquity appeals to his thoughts or his imagination. Aristotle anticipates Paul in an important dogma, and Cicero is an inspired writer whose books he feels inclined to kiss with reverence when he opens them. Often when reading the ancient philosophers or the poets he comes across something so chaste, so sacred, so inspired, that he cannot persuade himself but what some holy spirit brooded over them when they wrote. Perhaps the spirit of Christ has spread farther than we suspect, and there are many in the Congregation of Saints that we have not in the Calendar. Sometimes one can hardly refrain from saying: *Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis*.*

In so far as they record incidents of his own time, the Colloquies are to a great extent a slightly embellished account of Erasmus' personal experiences, or of events and occurrences that came under the observation of himself and his friends. There is more *Wahrheit* than *Dichtung* in the conversation of his motley troop of puppets, as a comparison of the epistles with the dialogues shows. In fact, a skeleton biography of Erasmus' life might be reconstructed from the Colloquies alone. His early student days at Paris are pictured in the account of Montagu college in the *Ichthyophagia*, and an unpleasant lenten experience at Freiburg—Eleutheropolis—is described in the same dialogues. Oftener the allusion is not so obvious. The *Convivium Poeticum* seems to be modeled upon reminiscences of Paris dinners of earlier times, one of which is described in a letter written by Erasmus for one of his pupils. Somewhat similar are some of the references to the pest, to the campaign of Julius the Second against the French, and to the loss of his money through the British customs' officers.

* The question of Aristotle's salvation had been seriously discussed in the mediaeval schools. Ibid., Lambertus, *De Salvatione Aristotle's Stagivitaæ*. Abelaird thought Socrates was among the saved.

Occasionally Erasmus repeats a good story from one of his Renaissance predecessors. He gets from Poggio's *Facetiae* the anecdote told of the sailor in the *Naufragium*, who promises St. Christopher at Paris a wax candle as large as his own giant statue at that place if he reaches shore in safety, and when admonished by a bystander of the impossibility of ever performing his vow, bids him hold his peace, lest he suggest the same thought to the Saint himself. A number of court anecdotes of Louis the eleventh are preserved in the *Colloquies*, most of them turning to the advantage of the king, and suggesting the fancy that that shrewd old monarch was not so unpopular with the commons as he had been with the historians.

One notices a number of literary coincidences in reading Erasmus, ideas and expressions that have appeared in later literature or in the bon mots and anecdotes of wits and literary men. These are quite possibly accidental in many cases. The borrowings that Rabelais made from Erasmus have already been discussed in a special monograph. The following few examples from English sources, which might be multiplied indefinitely by one curious in such matters, illustrate one phase of the kinship between Erasmus' writings and the popular literature of a later date.

In the opening of the *Convivium Religiosum*, the sentence *Non est muta rerum natura, sed usquequaque loquax est, multaque docet contemplantem*, suggests, in thought at least, Shakespeare's

Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything.

However St. Bernard had already said : *Aliquid amplius invenies in silvis quam in libris ; ligna et lapides docebunt te quod a magistris audire non potes.*

"All the world's a stage and men and women players," is more fully developed in the *Encomium* : *Porro mortalium vita omnis quid aliud est quam fabula quaequam, in qua alii aliis obtecti personis procedunt, aguntque suas quisque partes, donec choragus educat e proscenio.* This idea of life's being a comedy where each acts his part pervades all Erasmus' writings. *Partes agere, primas tenere* and the like are almost idioms with him. Of course the classical predecessor of Rip Van Winkle is referred to in the story of Epimonides, and the account of the newly-discovered island where the people live without labor upon the spontaneous fruits of the soil, and punish most severely of all crimes the breaking of the marriage vow, though even here the women are forgiven, but the men are compelled to go forever *membro pudendo velo oblecto*, smacks strongly of Gulliver. Pseudochei, who had practiced lying assiduously, but had only attained his present perfection in the art because he was born with unusual endowments for it, might be compared to Dr. Johnson's friend, who might have been born a fool, but must have devoted much study to improving upon it since. Erasmus' odd conceit about having fat bodies for winter and lean ones for summer may have suggested Sydney Smith's midsummer wish to "take off his flesh and sit in his bones."

There are artistic defects in the *Colloquies*. The characters and situations are a little uniform, the former representing more often types than individuals. But this work is different from anything else written in Latin. It is *sui generis*, and so is its Latinity.

There is an impression of variety, of versatility of expression produced by Erasmus' Latin, after reading a classical author, that is somewhat deceptive, and that greater familiarity with his works corrects. He does not use an unusually extensive vocabulary, and his syntax is as a rule extremely simple, modeled upon Terence and Plautus rather than upon Cicero, and almost as limpid and direct as that of modern French. His language is derived from so many different periods and different styles, however, that the effect is rather confusing to one accustomed only to the harmonious unity of a classical writer. But that despite this variety his vocabulary is almost a meagre one, relatively speaking, may be inferred from the fact that in an estimate based in each case upon about 33,000 words of text we find in the *Colloquies* an average vocabulary per 1000 words of 64; while in Nepos' *Lives* or Cicero's *Orations* it is approximately 100, and in the first six books of the *Aeneid*, including proper names, it is nearly 250.

This is due in part to the colloquial character of the Latin; the uniformity in characters and situations already noted reproduces itself in the language. The *Colloquies* also give us a good deal of *ex persona* Latin that is not Erasman, from the point of view of Latinity, any more than Sam Weller's English represents Dickens' best command of our own tongue. For instance, the priest, in the *Funus*, who crushes his rival with the pompous assertion: *Ego sum sacrae theologiae baccalaureus formatus, mox licentiaudus, atque etiam doctoris titulo insigniendus*, uses the dialect of his class, of course, as do the other speakers in that dialogue.

The words worthy of note in the *Colloquies* and the *Encomium Moriae* include some coined by Erasmus himself, or by his Renaissance contemporaries.

1. Feminine forms in *-trix*: *architectrix*, 800, E, also occurs twice in *Encomium Moriae*; *comitrix*, 853, C; *concionatrix*, 740, B; *fortunatrix*, 486, A; *largitrix*, 408, A; *lotrix*, 853, C; *obrectatrix*, 808, C; *propagatrix*, 412, C; *tutatrix*, 855, B.

2. Many new diminutives: *adpersiuncula*, 868, D; *affectatiuncula*, 659, A; *animalculum* (ascribed to Muretus by Krebs), 457, A; *caerimoniola*, 479, A, 502, D; *cerula*, a taper, 450, B; *cogitatiuncula*, 650, B; *compotatiuncula*, 646, E; *constitutiunculum*, 801, B; *degustatiuncula*, 504, B; *diutuscule* (*diuscule* occurs in Augustine), 655, F; *donariolum*, 779, B; *fragmentulum*, 781, B; *historiola*, 447, D; *obesulus*, 693, B, 756, D; *observatiuncula*, 801, B; *officiolum*, 638, F; *pedunculus*, 721, D; *persuasiuncula*, 452, A; *plantula*, 768, D; *praeceptiunculum*, 653, C; *praemiolum*, 780, F; *precula*, 709, C; *rosariola*, 809, A; *salarium*, 767, D; *salutatiuncula*, 809, A; *sanctulus*, 650, C; *stillula*, 504, A; *timidulus* (*timidule* occurs in Apuleius), 487, C; *traditiuncula*, 473, C, 474, A; *verbulum*, 492, D.

3. Somewhat akin to the diminutives are the words with the weakening prefix *sub*: *subaridus*, 763, A; *subblaeus*, 802, E; *subclaudico*, 829, A; *sublacivus*, 665, C; *subscateo*, 780, A; *subsibilo*, 856, E; *subuvidus* (*subudus* occurs in late Latin), 644, D; *suffuscatus*, 749, C; *suppulans*, 807, D. *Semi-* also has a weakening force in some of the following compounds: *semicalciatus*, 801, F, 869, D; *semicyathus*, 866, B; *semifatuus*, 820, B; *semimater*, 773, B; *semiputritius*, 865, E; *semireptilis*, 709, C; *semisapiens*, 452, A. On the other hand the strengthening prefixes are used much more rarely: *sesqui-* is used this way in *sesquihaereticus*, "a heretic and a half," 719, E (Erasmus also coins perhaps

sesquianuus, 738, D), and two instances of new compounds with *per* intensive occur, *permurmuro*, 485, D, and *perpulchre*, 819, E; *perbenignus*, 815, D, was doubtless classical, as *perbenigne* occurs in Cicero and Terence; *percalcatus*, 801, F, is an antonym to *semicalcatus*, mentioned above; though in mediaeval Latin *percalcari* refers to a custom of beating the bounds in land transfers.

4. There are a few new abstracts of Latin derivation: *balbuties* for *hesitantia*, 414, B, 773, B; *caecutientia*, a nuance of *caecitas*, approaching blindness, from the late Latin *caecutire*, 885, C; *comptura* for *comptus*, 418, E; *curtatio* and *longatio*, 753, C, are quoted street Latin terms; *digladiatio*, from *digladior*, a Ciceronian word, 459, B, 462, C, 872, C; *opploratio*, 775, B; *plagium*, plagiarism, 460, B (*plagiarius* used for plagiarist by Martial, is found with its original sense of kidnapper, 636, C); *putiditas*, 421, D; to which might be added *scaptus*, *sensu digitorum*, 715, D.

5. Quite a number of Greek words appear in Latin garb: *battalogia*, 832, E; *bulimia*, 787, F, 862, D; *chiromanticus*, 737, D; *epialus*, 665, F; *epomis*, doctor's hood, 742, C; *grammatophorus*, 781, A; *henas*, 826, C; *heptatechnus*, 736, A; *ichthyophagus*, 665, F; *idolate*, 667, B; *leberis*, 639, B; *monotechnus*, 736, A; *nomotheta*, 665, E; *oenopolus*, 642, C, and *oenopola*, 742, D (*onopolium* in Plautus); *oniropli*, 686, B; *onocratati*, 815, F; *operopolis* ("vel fructuaria"), 761, C; *Ossa*, 822, D; *pandocheus* for *cupo*, 717, F; *paraphrenesis*, 804, E; *penia*, 758, A; *philautia*, 421, E; *philotesia* (sc. *pocula*), healths, 419, D; *pinaceum* (*pinax*, plate in Du Gange) plate, tray, trencher, 717, D; *polyphagia* *polyphagus* in Suetonius), 866, C; *polyposia*, 866, C, *proaemia*, 802, F, and *proemium*, 758, C, *et passim*, are used for introduction, beginning; *progymnasmas*, 836, E; *protopirus*, for *tiro*, 736, D; *sychophanticus*, 837, B; *symphoniscus*, 440, C; *symposiarch*, 760, B; *syncretismus*, 812, C; *syphar*, 862, D; *typographi*, 835, E.

6. Among the miscellaneous words are a few compounds not found in Forcellini or Du Gange: *admentior*, 751, C; *depraedico*, 752, C; *derudo*, 741, A; *immusso*, 751, E; *praemando* (the participial form *praemansi*), 773, C; *supposito*, 465, A; and also *funambrilus*, rope walker, 866, E; *lactifluus*, 780, C; *mulo-triba*, muleteer, probably a mediaeval word (*mulus* + *τριβή*), 483, C; *unipes*, 838, B.

7. A number of words do not admit easily of classification. Among these are a few adverbs, *frustulatim*, 685, C; *gaudenter*, 886, F; *incircumspecte*, 649, B; *indefinenter*, 637, B; *irreparabiliter*, 864, E; *taurice* (*valeo taurice*), 632, D; *theologiter*, 492, D. There are also some adjectives: *amfractuosus* (*amfractus* in Du Gange), 838, C; *bombardicus*; *cacatilis*, foul, 824, E; *cardinalitius* (belonging to a cardinal), 691, B; *clitellatus*, 832, A; *convivatorius*, 819, E; *extemporarius*, 407, B; *gesticulosus*, 644, F; *menticulosus*, 665, E; *nervaceus*, 772, E; *potaticus*, 831, D; *praestigiatorius*, 884, D; *praestrenuus*, 756, C.

8. A few nouns and verbs do not fall under any of the preceding classes: *confabulones*, 709, A; *exhilarator* (*exhilaratio* in Du Gange), 676, E; *extorsio* (which is the equivalent in form of *extortio* in Du Gange), 812, D; *fabulamentum*, 437, A; *holosericati*, 818, A; *incrustamentum* (*incrustura* in Du Gange), 674, C; *latero*, "*laterones et ambulones*," 844, B; *naviculator* (once thought to be in Cicero, cf. Krebs), 864, D; *notaria*, 844, D; *promotor*, for *adiutor*, 483,

C; *quaestoria*, 844, D; *responsator*, 745, C; *telus*, toll, 778, E; *urticetum*, nettle bed, 738, E; *utricines*, bagpipers, 827, A; *circumcursito*, 685, D; *vapesco*, to become vapid (of wine), 661, D.

9. Erasmus occasionally uses classical words in novel senses or relations: *asininus*, stupid, 435, A; *auriculae*, the ears on a fool's cap, 742, B; *caballus*, in the mediaeval sense, "*si bellos alunt caballos*," 479, D; *calculus*, score, respect, "*Quo quidem calculo superant pueritiam*," 414, B; *quod sint viris multis calculis fortunatiores*, 418, D; *charta*, card, 439, B, and *chartarius*, card player, 836, A; *concionator*, priest, 406, A; *inter coniugatos* (sc. *convivas*), 699, F; *condonatio*, for *indulgentiae* (640, B), 444, A; *se dilatat*, "he is puffed up," 448, A; *divido*, explain, *eloco*, give in marriage, *elocare liberos*, 636, B, 844, D; *eliquo*, to clear up, of ore or metal yielding material, 758, D; *exhaustus* exhausted, work out, 422, D; *fasculi*, fagots, 852, A; *frontispicium* (mediaeval, façade), frontispiece, title page, 850, A; *gales* (sc. *navis*), crow's nest, 712, C; *iacula*, shafts of wit, repartee, 716, A; *inauspiciatus*, unlucky, inauspicious, hectic, feverish, 789, D; *lucernarius*, burning midnight oil; *philosophi, lucernarii*, 422, E; *periodus* (in original sense, 423, A), *saeculorum periodus*, I, 747, B; *rescribo*, ascribe, 422, E; *succino*, suggest, 446, A; *umbratilis*, immaterial, ghostly, *cymbam umbratilem*, 830, D.

It is rather curious to see how Erasmus employs old words or coins phrases out of old words to express modern ideas, or to denote modern things. In connection with a dwelling house we find *cornix*, a knocker, 766, A; *sera*, lock; "*reliquit clavim in sera*," 836, E; *museion*, a dressing room (study, 668, F, and 830, E), 718, E; *aestuarium*, 716, C, *hypocaustum*, 716, D, *vaporarium*, 739, B, all indicate the heated living room or public room of an inn, the sign is a *tabula pensilis*, 739, B; *vitreae fenestrae volubiles* are glazed French windows, 688, C, and *pensile cubiculum* is possibly a hammock, 689, B, while *meta distillatoria*, 769, E, is apparently a still. *Ruscula insularia*, 862, F, seem to have been tenement house courts. *Vestis coronis* is a lady's train; *pallium sacrum*, a priest's surplice, 762, A; *apposititia coma*, a wig, 432, A; *galerum cardinalitium*, a conventional term, means a cardinal's hat, 691, B, 856, B; while *ocreae* means regularly leather leggings, 644, C, 716, D. Courtiers are, naturally, *proceres aulici*, 480, C; *spiculator publicus* is apparently a police official, 808, D. *Daduchi*, 813, E, and *histriones luctus*, 346, B, are hired mourners, and the death knell is *strepitus campanarum*, 816, B. *Quadrulae* and *orbes*, 667, A, are small dishes, while *discus*, 849, B, is used for *ferculum*, course. *Cultellus escarius* is a table knife, 865, B, and *gladiolus scriptorius* is a penknife. *Sphaera pensilis*, 688, E, is a geographical globe, and *sphaerula bombarbica* a shot, 815, B. A squirrel's cage is *cavea rotatilis*, 775, A, a fast day, *dies pisculentus*, 737, E, and *infantulus* means cherub, 771, A, and *rem divinam*, mass, 762, A. Erasmus does not use the regular mediaeval term *rosaria*, for rosary, once. In one instance he uses the diminutive *rosariola*, 809, A, in another *sphaerulae precatoriae*, 866, E, and upon one occasion, when he feels particularly humorous, he employs the metaphor, *ova serpentium*, 774, D.

We exclude from the following list of mediaeval words technical theological terms, proper names of persons and places, and words which are merely quoted for illustration, without forming an integral part of the text, such as the list of mediaeval

titles on page 620 of the *Colloquies*. The words cited are as a rule those that do not appear in the body of Forcellini's Lexicon, but are found in Du Cange. A very few words that were doubtless common in Latin before the Renaissance period but are not to be found in the latter work are given first. They are, *alcumista*, an alchemist, 754, B (We also find *alcumisticus*, corresponding to *alchymistici* in Du Cange, 752, F, *et passim*, and *alcumistica* (sc. *ars*) used absolutely for alchemy, id.); *aristocratia*, as we have seen, is found in scholastic Latin; *cacodaemones*, evil spirits, 701, E, is found in the *Acta Sti. Ignatii*; *commissarius*, commissioner, 642, F; *galeata navis*, 862, D, a galley (*Navis galea*, it will be remembered, occurs in the *Gesta*); *halbardarcha*, halberd, 831, D; perhaps *ioncherus*, *Junker*, cadet, young nobleman, 835, E; *sophista*, 769, C, for a doctored horse. Du Cange, however, gives an instance in the statutes of Marseilles where *sophisticare* means to adulterate. *Sophista* in the *Waltharius* means a wise man, elder, sage.

The words found in Du Cange may be classified as follows :

(1) Official terms relating to the ecclesiastical or civil organization : *copista*, 483, C; *feudum*, 828, B; *heroïna*, a baroness, 744, F; *marchio*, 717, E; *monarcha*, 633, D; *momus*, a proper name in the *Encomium*, means mummer in mediaeval Latin, 416, D; *officiarius*, 764, D; *parochus*, as priest, 811, B, *et passim*; *secretarius*, 483, C; and the canon law terms, *irregularitas*, 872, A; *repressalia*, 830, A, and *simonia*, 801, E.

(2) Associated with the official church terms are certain words and phrases referring to matters of ritual; *aqua lustralis* and *aqua sacra*, 700, E; 814, E; *calendarium sancterum*, 691, F; *horariae preces*, 754, D; *horae canonicae*, 746, C; *nocturnales*, 872, B; and words that received a special meaning later through being applied to particular orders or sects of orders : *conventuales*, 869, E, and *penitentiarii*, 720, A. Relating also to the ecclesiastical side of mediaeval life are a few such words as *bulia*, a papal bull, from the earlier meaning, seal, 640, B; *capero* (*caparo* in Du Cange, probably cognate with *caput* and our word cap), a monk's hood, 856, A, 868, B; *mitra*, which received its special meaning about the tenth century, 780, D; *campana*, 816, B, and *nola*, 783, B, 811, F, for bells, are probably mediaeval or very late Latin; and *refectorium*, refectory, 802, D.

(3) Erasmus' cosmopolitan experience is illustrated in the variety of coins mentioned in the *Colloquies* : *bagathinum*, probably cognate with bagatelle, a very small Italian coin, 864, D; *carolinus* (not mentioned in Du Cange), 720, B; *coronatus*, 762, E; *ducatus*, 685, B; *florenus*, 764, D; *liardus*, 668, F; *regalis aureus*, 751, A; *scutatus*, 668, F.

(4) Among the words not easily classified are two referring to war, *bombarda* (probably cognate with *bomby*, a gun), 708, F, and *snafanus* (*snaphthanus*, in Du Cange), a word of Germanic derivation, probably from *schnappen*, from which comes our word knapsack, meaning a "bummer" or irregular soldier, 742, E. There are also the diminutives *conviviolum*, 669, D, *horula*, 688, C, and *laminula*, 724, A. *Monachismus*, the life or observance of a monk, 700, F, *sabbatismus*, the observance of the sabbath, 792, E, are conventional derivatives. Other words coming under this general head are *baccalaureus*, 802, A; *cambire*, 667, F; *cerevisarius*, 835, A; *cimelium*, 763, A; *corbona*, an offering, 795, C; *fructuaria*, an apple-woman, 761, C; *fustanius*, fustian, 834, E; *magistraliter*, 466,

A; *merdosus*, 851, D; *pandocheum*, inn, 715, F; *perspicillum* (also *conspicilia* and *ocularia* in Du Cange), spectacles, 673, C, 780, E; *reiuvenesco*, 826, F; *tymbus*, tomb, 813, E.

We have seen enough of Erasmus' vocabulary to infer already, what we find to be true, that the *sermo plebius* furnished a not inconsiderable list of words to his Latin. Omitting the theological terms, which would have been justified even in the language of a purist, we shall consider here only those words that have a place in general literature in virtue of their signification, if not of their form. We shall classify them, however, with reference to their source rather than to their form or meaning.

(1) The Vulgate furnishes *architriclinus*, head waiter, 760, B; *carnalis*, carnal, 799, E; *cinericius* (possibly in Varro), ashen, ash gray, 823, A; *circumcisio*, 790, F; *concupiscentia*, 418, B; *cornupeta*, horned, 742, D; *cortina*, curtain, 653, D; *decimatio*, tithes, 792, C; *glorifico*, 687, C; *ieiuno*, 684, A; *illuminatus*, 465, A; *immolatus*, 681, D; *inconsutilis*, 466, E; *invisibilia* (used absolutely), 509, A; *iustifico*, 814, B; *lanciarus*, found also in an inscription, a pike-man, 859, E; *latomi*, stone-cutters, 821, D; *leprosus*, 828, E; *magnates*, 737, D; *mansio*, in sense of mansion, 683, B; *manzar*, "liberi ex incesto nati," 811, C; *momentaneus*, *mortificatio*, 867, E; *nuditas*, 684, F; *obstetrico*, 766, D; *obturatio*, 788, E; *orphanus*, 816, E; *perstillo*, 770, E; *regulus*, for basilisk, 739, E; *sanctificator*, 687, D; *scandalum*, 798, B; *sigillatim*, 413, A.

(2) The following words appear first in the patristic writings: Tertullian leads with *confabulatio (librorum)*, which perhaps should be assigned to the Vulgate, "*Bonos corrumpant mores confabulationes malae*," ad. Ux., II, 3; 641, B; *elemosyna*, 684, A; *ethnicus*, a pagan, applied more especially to the philosophers, 676, C; *exorcismus*, 749, A; *illecto*, 841, D; *inauguratio*, 786, F; *laicus*, 792, A; *martyr*, 783, C; *monasterium*, 798, B; *natalis*, 824, E; *nudipes*, 886, P; *ogdoas*, 841, A; *ovicula*, 811, B; *patriarcha*, 698, F; *retorico*, 475, A. From St. Jerome come *antagonista*, 460, C; *cuculla*, a monk's hood, 643, A; *lucernula*, 687, E; *monachus*, 652, E, and *monacha*, 698, B; *sophistria*, *deceptrix*, 745, D; while Augustine first uses in literature *deliciose*, 886, C; *excommunicatus* (the superlative is found in Erasmus), 728, C; *inscrutabilis* (used absolutely in the Vulgate), 669, C; *philosophaster*, 423, B; *purgatorium* (sc. *ignis* for *ignis purgans*), 814, B; *submurmuro*, 856, E.

(3) There are also many words that belong to very late Latin—many of them from the Christian writers—that can hardly be classified according to authors. Some are from the glosses and scholia, or the inscriptions. To this latter class belong *aedificiolus*, found only in inscriptions and probably coined anew by Erasmus, 689, C; *anarchia*, 766, E; *donatitius*, 763, D; *fascinator*, 752, F; *logodaedali*, "*artifici sermonis fabricatores*," 433, C; *micatio*, 772, C; *praestigium*, 673, D; *precatium*, 692, C, *et passim*; *saginato*, 664, C; From the late writers come *accino*, accent, 749, E; *aggravatio*, 483, D; *anatomia*, 811, A; *cancellarius*, 763, E; *cardinalis* (from *cardo*, hinge, meaning originally a chamber attendant); *cereolus*, for taper, 443, C; *dapsilitas*, 887, D; *dedecorosus*, 719, A; *filiatio*, 465, A; *immediate*, 799, B; *insensibiliter*, 728, B; *irreconciliabilis*, 676, B; *irrefutabilis*, 852, B; *minutia*, 721, E; *monasterium*, 652, E; *mutatorium*, 741, E; *myriades*, 641, C; *paganismus*, 792, D; *protervia*, 828, B; *scortatio*, 720, B; *sitacula*, 647, D; *sub-indico*, 764, E.

Under the previous head we have mentioned a number of words that are cited but once in the lexicon references. There are many others of this class, but drawn for the most part from a better period of Latin, that occur in the vocabulary of humanists. This cosmopolitan feature of his verbal apparatus is not peculiar to Erasmus, but is characteristic of the greater part of New Latin literature.

These words, occurring in the works of a single Roman writer, and even there frequently used but a single time, had in many instances worked their way into the Middle Age vocabulary, and doubtless formed part of the school room speech that the Renaissance writers acquired together with their conversational mastery of the language; so the objection that they were less familiar than the regular classical term could not be urged against them. They also in a certain way add variety to the language, and enable an author to avoid repetition occasionally, serving the same purpose that the Saxon and Romance synonyms do in our own language in this respect. As an illustration we quote a sentence from the *Puerpera*, which might be matched a number of times in the *Colloquies*; *Estne igitur corporeus animus, ut a rebus corporalibus afficiatur?* On the other hand a late Latin word that on account of its frequent use in Christian literature was more familiar to his readers than the classical term sometimes entirely displaces the latter in Erasmus' writings. So we find *alimonia* regularly for *alimentum* and *ambulacrum* for *ambulatio*.

Of those words which stand in Latin literature upon the authority of a single writer very many, naturally, come from Cicero. In accordance with what we already have seen as to the familiar character of Erasmus' style, we find a large number of Ciceronian diminutives; *ambulatiuncula*, 672, F; *cantiuncula*, 677, A; 695, D; *labecula*, 769, B; *mercedula*, 708, D; *negotiola* (found also in Plautus), 635, B; *munusculum*, 687, F; *perpusillus*, 733, C; *praediolum* (once also in Pliny), 672, E; *pulchellus*, 756, D; and *leguleius*, 818, A, *et passim*. The last word had been a favorite with the early humanists in their attacks upon the jurists, who represented the mediæval party in the Italian universities. Other Ciceronian words not appearing elsewhere in classical literature are *asotus*, 660, E; *compotatio*, 417, A; *compotor*, 639, F; *inficialis*, 802, C; *oscitanter*, 724, E; *pervetustus*, 778, A; *politia*, 675, D; *purpurasco* (of grapes), 693, A; *rusticatio*, country life, 672, E; *sannio*, 740, B; 779, C; *subdubito*; and *myrothecium*, which is Greek in Cicero and is one of the words of that language found only in the works of a Roman writer, 748, B.

It is a curious fact, though one not especially remarkable when we consider under what conditions the restoration of ancient Latin took place at the time of the Renaissance, that many words coined or employed by the earliest Roman writers and neglected entirely so far as we can learn by their successors, seem to have been restored to full right of citizenship in the vocabulary of the humanists. Some of these words were doubtless archaic or plebeian by-forms that continued to be used in the colloquial language until they were taken up into Christian literature. Such, for instance, was *adhaesus*, 772, A; which after appearing in Lucretius worked along in the subterranean depths of the language until it came to light again in the Vulgate. So common a word in Christian times as *hymnus*, 676, C, had been taken into Latin by Lucilius in the second century B. C. The same writer also uses *combibo*, 640, B, which also appears later in Cicero, however; and his con-

temporary or predecessor Pacuvius *cicuro*, which Erasmus uses of intellectual discipline, 850, A and B. *Nigreo*, 675, C, comes from the same writer. The early comedian Turpilius used *feroculus*, 756, D; Varro is authority for *hilaresco*, 819, B, *subulcus*, 740, F, *undulatus* (thorax), 644, B. *Cascus*, in the sense of *senex*, 420, C, and another early Latin word *vitilitigator*, 402, occur. From Lucretius again we have *gravatim*, 446, A; while Catullus supplies *eruditulus*, 835, E, and *inficetiae*. There are many words peculiar to Terence in the Colloquies, *cadaverosus*, 432, B; *incogitans* (later in Ausonius), 434, D; *deambulatio*, 697, D; *expiscor*, 651, D; *grandiusculus*, 653, F; *prodeambulo*, 635, D. Plautus is drawn upon still more freely, *alliatum*, 717, B; *basilicus*, 632, C; *agoranomus*, 788, F; *cenaticus*, as an adjective, 661, B; *congerro*, 635, D, *et passim*; *incogitantia*, 414, B; *mendicabulum*, 786, D; *oenopolium*, 648, F; *pancraticus* and *athletice*, 631, B; *polymachaeroplacidae*, 823, E; *stultesco*, 415, B; *suffuror*, 777, B; *surrepticius*, 794, E; *tusculum*, 453, B; and *vidulus*, 494, C, which last is a word that appears later in the Vulgate.

Passing over the classical writers, merely pausing to remark that the rare words from this period are frequently diminutives again, such as *cornicula*, 798, D, 407, A, from Horace; *unciola*, 827, F, 418, B, from Juvenal; *leviusculus*, from Pliny, 882, B, and *imaguncula*, 781, B, from Suetonius, we come to those writers whose works are strongly tinged with plebeian Latinity. In Petronius we find the adverb *blandum*, 837, B; *catastrophe*, 678, F, 785, B; and *pharmacus*, which means an apothecary in later Latin, however. Apuleius perhaps introduced more plebeian words than any other pagan writer which took root in the literary Latin of the Middle Ages and survived the pruning process that took place at the time of the Renaissance. To him are due *byssus*, a cotton or linen cloth, also mentioned in the Vulgate, 825, A; *cantillo*, 721, B; *capillitium*, 472, A; *circumtortus*, 831, D; *dissitus*, 752, A; *exercitamentum*, 648, D; *fastidienter*, 501, C; *foliola*, 864, B; *inabsolutus*, 776, F; *infantulus*, 714, A; 768, C (also *infantula*, 698, D); *interula* (sc. *tunica*), 743, B; *laniena*, butchery, 775, C; *nugamenta*, 459, A; *sebaceus*, a tallow dip, 713, D; *seniculus*, 738, F, 786, D; *ultramundaneus*, 467, A; *viaticulum*, 736, E. In addition to other words Gellius is authority for *bibax*, 659, D, and *linguax*, 645, E, *et passim* (*petax* comes from a late grammarian, 649, E); and also *locutuleius*, 850, E, something like Cicero's *leguleius*. Two compounds with *sub* come from Ammianus, *submoestus*, 704, A, and *subodoror*, 754, E. The *Corpus Iuris* contributed a number of words to New Latin through the medium of the jurists. We find in the *Colloquies* and *Encomium*, *criminaliter*, 797, D; *deipara*, 445, C; *exorcista*, 751, C; *expositio* (exposure of an infant), 767, C; *manuaria*, 686, D; *nativitas* (also in Vulgate and Tertulian), 729, D; *orthodoxus*, 732, C; *pelliceus*, 736, F; *pharmacum*, 421, F; *repubesco*, 415, B; *venditrix*, 772, D.

The above lists, especially in case of those words that date back to the Roman period, must be taken as representative rather than exhaustive. They are sufficient, however, to show this: that Erasmus, who was the man of letters *par excellence* of his generation, and whose works have exercised a greater positive influence upon his own times and subsequent literature than those of any other New Latin author, although he was a humanist, was just as far from being a purist so far as vocabulary was concerned as were the schoolmen who preceded the Revival

of Learning. Not only this; but it was vulgar Latin that determined the color of his style. Of course this was due in great part to the influence of Christian literature; but it is indicated not only by direct contributions of words and phrases, though these are numerous, but also by a linguistic taste that led Erasmus to coin new words after the form and fashion of plebeian rather than of classical Latin, and by a preference for diminutives and derivatives that is apparent in all his Latin writings. Of course the *Colloquies*, where he is painting every day life, afford us more examples of non-classical formations than his other works; but even in translations from pagan authors, from Lucian for instance, Erasman words are not infrequent. In a few pages taken at random in the first volume of his complete works, all of them from Lucian, we find the following: *moniugarum rerum*, 252, E; *inidoneus*, 220, F; *insultus*, attack, 224, C; *defensa ulum*, 264, A; *dilucularius*, 264, F; *iurgiter*, 301, B.

While Erasmus frequently uses diminutives, frequentatives and compounds with discrimination, and employs the modified forms to express more exactly a finer shade of meaning, it is not safe to presume upon this in all instances where the derived forms are used. *Corpusculum* occurs *passim* for *corpus* in the *Colloquies*. Where we have an instance of the discriminating use of a compound, as "*Vos certastis, at non decertastis*, 727, F, it can be matched by such irregular uses as, *cum pictum florem cum vivo decertantem videmus*, 674, E, or, *coccyx et luscinia inter se canendi gloria decertantes*, 727, A. *Desterto*, 702, D, has the directly opposite meaning to that given to it by Perseus. In the description of almost exactly parallel situations, 761, A, and 762, B, *clamito* is used in the first instance and *clamo* in the second.

Erasmus has certain favorite words and expressions that are so common as almost to characterize his prose. Such are *divino*, surmise, think, and *divinatio*; *religio* in the sense of a religious scruple or matter of principle; *partes*, *partes agere*, *nostrae partes*, *primas partes*, etc.; *usu venire*, to occur; *blandior* and its compounds and derivatives in the greatest variety of significations. *Blandum* and *blande*, 810, F, both occur as adverbs; and *blanditur* is used impersonally for "It is a pleasant day." *Frigeo* in its figurative sense of languish, be at a standstill, is common, and wrath is usually indicated by one of the compounds of *can-deo*, *incandesco*, *exandesco*. Erasmus' critics called him *porrophagus* on account of his frequent use of that word, and *immo* is a particle that stands in equal favor with him. *Facinus* with its Plautan meaning of "thing" occurs occasionally, and *fabula* is used at least once in the same general sense,—*puella, maxima huius fabulae pars*, 488, A—a little like the colloquial use sometimes made of the German word *geschichte*. *Citra* and *absque* are frequently used for *sine*. *Iuxta* is employed more freely and designates a rather wider range of relations than is usual in classical Latin.

The orthography of a Latin writer of this period need not detain us long, as it was entirely traditional and gives very little clue to the phonetic history of that language or of the vernacular. The question of spelling was a relatively important one in the Middle Ages, when the manuscript transmission of past knowledge was the principal function of letters. Bede and, as we have seen, Alcuin, wrote works upon the subject. At the time of the Renaissance the revival of classical Latin led to a sympathetic attempt to restore classical orthography. Old manu-

scripts and inscriptions were cited as authority for many changes, or rather for the final selection and uniform use of one of the several doubtful forms of a word. But it was long before usage became definitely settled, and the question of phonetic reform was a source of frequent discussion and dispute among the humanists. Absolute uniformity had not been secured even by Erasmus' time. He spells *lacrimae* as we do to-day in most cases; but still we find *lacrymas*, 483, B; and some editions have *lachrimas*, 446, B. *Braveum*, 647, B, and *Brabeum*, 761, B, are both found in the *Colloquies*. The following points may be worth noting also, as having some bearing upon sixteenth century philology.

(1) The distinction between the long vowels and the diphthongs is not closely drawn in all cases. *ae* takes the place of *e* occasionally, *collosacus*, 781, C; *ef-fraenus*, 851, B; *laeves*, 418, D; the reverse is seen in *pene*, 480, A. *Ei* takes the place of *e*,—*omneis*, *treis*, 460, A; *mortaleis*, 463, D. *Heic* is the regular form for the adverb in Erasmus.

(2) The irregular use or omission of the aspirate is common. The cases where it is most noticeable are *cors*, which occurs regularly for *cohors*, and *charus* and *charitas*, for *carus* and *caritas*. This last is probably due to Greek influence.

(3) Other irregularities have hardly disappeared from Latin at the present day. There is uncertainty about double consonants; *caussa* and *caussor* are the usual forms; *cominus* occurs, 427, C; and other examples of this sort might be given. We generally find *c* for *t* before *i* followed by another vowel in Erasmus, but this is not invariably so; e. g., *negociator*, 444, B; but *negotium*, 691, A. *Ipsus* for *ipse*, 774, C, is probably a reminiscence of Plautus.

By Erasmus' time the best writers were seldom guilty of gross errors of syntax; in fact their works often approached much nearer to classical perfection in this respect than do those of a period but slightly removed from the Augustan age. As Erasmus was not a Ciceronian, however, he drew his construction, like his vocabulary, from a wide range of writers. Occasionally an isolated instance of a solecism—for example, *a nemine*, 470, C, for which, however, he might plead the authority of Tacitus—creeps into his works; but there is very seldom a combination of words in his writings that could not be justified by an appeal to good Roman usage. The variety of construction in Erasmus is very great. He did about everything with his words that the traditions of the language allowed; but he very seldom overstepped the bounds which those traditions set. In his syntax, as in his theology, he was a liberal; but he always intended to be orthodox.

As it would not be particularly profitable to assemble here a large number of familiar syntactical forms, we shall content ourselves with mentioning one or two that are interesting either because they are uncommon, or because they are in a sense favorites with Erasmus, and employed by him so often as to affect the color of his literary style.

Like many a modern English author, Erasmus often wrote under the shadow of a classical model, and this model varied somewhat with the character of the work which he was writing. In the *Colloquies* and the *Encomium Moriae* we see abundant evidence of the influence of the comic writers. This is shown not only by occasional centos and allusions, and by frequent instances of ellipsis, especially in such colloquial expressions as *Quid multa?* *Quid multis* (sc. *verbis otus*)? *Qui sic?* *Quid ita?*, but also by the recurrence of constructions often found in

Plautus and Terence and not common in other writers. The appositional genitive occurs frequently in such expressions as *delicias hominis*, 644, A, *nugamentum hominis*, 645, F, *somnium hominis*, 643, C, *syphar hominis*, 862, D, and with almost partitive force in *vulgus hominum*, 682, F *et passim*; *vulgus oratorum*, 407, B. In place of the partitive genitive we have *genus* in the appositional relation, *hoc genus hominibus*, 722, D; *hoc genus oblectamentis*, 410, E; *id genus deorum*, 409, C; *id genus multa*, 482, E; *id genus labores*, 483, B. Such instances of adverbial comparison occur as, *abunde magnum*, 441, D; *minime mendax*, 408, B; *vehementer obesae*, 761, C; *oppido sacrum*, 781, A; *oppido salutaris*, 496, A. *Omnissimum*, 798, A, was doubtless suggested by Plautus' *ipsissimus*. Other expressions that suggest the Latin of daily life are *pulchre noverant*, 828, A, and the middle use of *habeo*, *coepit habere meliuscule*, 802, B. *Tantum non enecabar*, 775, B, is probably a popular rather than a literary construction.

Prepositions are used with their classical force and signification, and we see no tendency to employ them where a case ending satisfactorily expresses a relation. Classical official usage affords the analogy for such expressions as *esse a secretis*, 462, C; *nomina episcoporum a suffragiis*, 780, A; *tales a poculis (tales pocillatores)*, 717, A; *manum angeli qui est Virgini ab epistolis*, 775, A. The proper names *Harpalus a Como*, and *Comes a Nassauen*, 835, A and B, are of course used in professed imitation of mediæval custom. *Ad* is used occasionally to express comparison, *ceteras reliquias nihil esse ad tam sacrum lac*, 779, D. *Philosophor* is used as a transitive, *dum nubes et ideas philosophatur*, 423, A, and *occino* is similarly used on two occasions, *occino encomium*, 642, C, and *occino cantionem*, 695, D. *Huius facio sapientes* is a construction justified only through analogy by classical usage, and we sometimes, though very rarely, find instances of loose construction, *Vulgus hominum existimat se non frustra vixisse, si per fas nefasque congestas divitias relinquunt morientes*, 682, F; and, *nonne eodem fere pertinet, cum singulae regiones suum aliquem peculiarem vindicant divum?* 445, C; where we apparently have a substantive clause in the indicative introduced by *cum*.

It is hardly necessary to say more about Erasmus' syntax. It harmonizes with his vocabulary, leaning, in the *Colloquies* at least, decidedly more to the simple construction of the comic writers and plebeian Latin than to the more elaborate periodic structure of the Roman orators and historians. Renaissance syntax is artificial to this extent, that it does not indicate anything as to the organic development of the language. Its validity rests upon the authority of previous authors rather than upon colloquial usage; and to those authors we naturally go for original information about the constructions found in their works. The simplicity of Erasmus' syntax is a matter of style rather than of grammar; it is a personal element, not something acquired in schools. He was naturally more French than German in his way of thinking and of expressing himself. The involved sentence did not fit his mind. The elements of his sentences as a rule follow each other in the logical order, the predicate in the middle.*

When we come to the question of stylé pure and simple, we are upon ground

* Il n'est pas excessif de dire que le style d'Érasme, dans ses Lettres surtout a déjà comme un air de famille avec le langage rapide de notre dix huitième siècle français, et l'on peut conclure avec certitude qu'il a dû à la forme heureuse et nette qu'il sait donner à sa pensée une grande partie de son influence littéraire. Feugère, o. c., 443.

where originality has full play. Except possibly in case of some extreme Ciceronians, the style of one Renaissance writer is not that of any other; nor is it easily to be mistaken for that of a classical author. Some of the Ciceronians did acquire a style that was very evidently an imitation of Cicero's; but even then they established their individuality in their works by the degree of perfection that they attained in this imitation. The same is true of the Florentine historians, who wrote with Livy for a model. Erasmus' Latin is quite different from this. It is as individual as is Voltaire's French or Sterne's English. It is as much his own as the contents of the works themselves. Moreover, within the bounds which personality sets, it varies somewhat with his different writings, adapting itself to the character of the subject. *Stultitia*, in the *Encomium Moriae*, is represented as a woman, and she pleads her cause with feminine volubility, seldom ending her sentences until she is out of breath, abounding in asyndeton and ellipsis, stringing word upon word in vagrant, never-ending categories that sometimes seem to include everything in heaven and on earth and in the regions beneath the earth. In the *Colloquies* characters from all the walks of life appear, princes and bishops, merchants and craftsmen, pious pilgrims and vagabond charlatans, monks and gallants, noble dames and jolly goodwives, nuns and courtesans, old men at their gossip and young boys at their games—all speaking *ex personis* with the language appropriate to their respective callings and conditions. It is evident therefore that a study of style based exclusively upon these two works cannot be fairly representative of Erasmus. They are characterized by those figures of syntax that are common in every day conversation. They seldom give opportunity to employ the grand style in writing affected by the humanists in those forgotten panegyrics and orations upon which they based their literary reputation and their hopes of lasting fame. Erasmus could write works of this sort if he tried: it was largely a matter of practice. But he really preferred a Dutch interior to an Italian fresco. So that while from the point of view of mere Latinity, of purity and correctness of style alone, the *Colloquies* and the *Encomium Moriae* do not represent Erasmus at his best, they are the works which are most strictly Erasman, the ones that first occur to us when his name is mentioned; and even from the linguistic standpoint they are those of most interest to us, because in language as well as in form and content they are probably the most original masterpieces of New Latin literature.

To return to matters of detail, an exhaustive complication of all the figures in these two works would form a book of itself. A few illustrations from fairly representative examples will serve our purpose here. We have already mentioned the frequency of ellipsis. In case of *pars* it occurs after *primas*, *primas tenet sapientia*, 845, D; after *virili*, *pro mea virili*, 636, D *et passim*; with *cetera*, *pennis cetera nigris*, 690, F. *Hora* is omitted after the numerals in such phrases as *ad quintam*, 649, C *et passim*. *Ars* is omitted after *sutoria*, 684, D; *alchimistica*, 752, F; *chiromantica*, 737, D. Similarly *recta* (sc. *via*), 823, B, and *vili* (sc. *pretio*), 716, B, occur. *Ut* is omitted after *oportet*, *ponat oportet*, 411, D; *faciat oportet*, 822, A; *facio*, *fac adsis*, 660, A; *fac merere*, 824, C; *rogo*, *rogo iubeas*, 764, E. Asyndeton is so common in all Erasmus' works as to be a characteristic feature of his style. Such examples of the omissions of conjunctions between words as, *cuius arbitrio bella, paces, imperia, consilia, iudicia, comitia, connubia, pacta, foedera, leges, artes, ludicria, seria*, etc.—*administrantur*, 409, C; and between

sentences, *Tolle hoc vitae condimentum, et frigebit cum sua actione orator, nulli placebit cum suis numeris musicus, explodetur cum sua gesticulatione histrio, ridebitur una cum suis Musis poeta, sordebit cum sua arte pictor, esuriet cum phar-macis medicus*, 421, E, occur very frequently. We might mention here obiter that it is a favorite device with Erasmus—one of the simple constructions that come down from plebeian Latin and the Vulgate—to substitute an imperative for a prepositive conditional sentence.

Instances of brachyology are common: *linguam audivimus, sed ego metuebam tibi a manibus*, 721, C; *exorietur autem repente nova rerum species ut qui modo mulier, nunc vir; qui modo iuuenis, mox senex*, etc., 428, C. Ennalage and chiasmus occur less frequently. *Hos vetustas credidit*, 712, C; and *multo ficisque recentibus agricolarum lascivia consueverit oblinere*, 416, A, are examples of the former, while in the Encomium, 422, D, Demosthenes is characterized as *tam ignavus miles quam orator sapiens*.

While rhetorical figures are not forced or affected in Erasmus' writings, they are very common. He compiled a collection of similes, and attributes to such figures *non nitorem modo, sed universam prope sermonis dignitatem*. An example or two from many will suffice, as they are rather formal in any case: *principem—qui vel, seu sidus salutare, morum innocentia maximam rebus humanis salutem possit afferre, vel, veluti cometa letialis, summam perniciem invehere*, 479, C. We are tempted to add one more likeness bearing upon the same subject, partly because it illustrates Erasmus' position with reference to the final source of kingly authority, and also because it is borrowed apparently from a mediæval work, *De Regimine principis*, usually attributed to Aquinas. Erasmus owes no small debt to the political teachings of the scholastic philosophy. This quotation occurs in the *Convivium Fabulosum*, 762, C; *quod enim animus est corpori, hoc est bonus prin-cips reipublicae. Quid opus erat addere 'bonus,' quando malus princeps non est princeps; quem ad modum spiritus impurus qui invasit corpus hominis non est animus*.

Metaphor, however, is the most important and the most common of all figures in Erasmus' writings. He uses it not only in the conventional way, to embellish and ornament, or to add force and precision to a paragraph. He recurs to it with the instinct of a language maker, to add the copiousness and variety of his vocabulary, until the language becomes plastic and vital in his hands. Of course, Erasmus was not always equally happy in hitting upon a latent synonym to express his thought, and he sometimes employed metaphors that had already become conventional; but the effect upon the whole was doubtless to add much vigor and freshness to his language. The following examples are representative. They contain the misses as well as the hits. *Aestatis incendium*, 789, B; *aegrotat crumena*, 632, B; *mussant civitates*. (This suggests, by way of contrast, a curiously pompous sentence used by Sidonius in a similar connection, Ep. 1, 2, 2: *Mussilat quidem iuvenum nostrorum calcata generositas*), 759, C; *palatum obsurduerat*, 661, C; *incrudescit tempestas*, 712, D; *incrudescit rixa*, 702, E; *mali novum genus, cuius matrem ego hisce manibus consevi*, 667, A, and, *fici—modo decerptos a matre*, 721, D; *culinae regina*, 841, E, and *culinae praelecta*, 673, A, are rather suggestive; *epilogus* and *proemium convivii*, 819, A; *apum regnum*, 676, B; *politiam formicarum*, 675, D; *sarcio* for *emendo*, *passim*; *nubeculae* for

initia irarum, 703, B; *alvearia* for *monasteria*, 823, C; *flosculorum stellulae*, 690, E; *lixivium lacrimarum*, 882, F; *frons* for *pudor*, *minimum esse frontis*, 643, A; *alea* for *fortuna* or *periculum*, 641, A and B; *ventris suburra*, 'a stay for the stomach,' 648, B; *columna ecclesiae*, 801, E; *matrimonii nassa*, 837, B; *promicare*, to spring forward, 715, D; and, euphemistically, *colloquium* for *congressus*, *ante nuptias fuit mihi cum eo colloquium*, 707, A. The familiar, *provinciam detrectare*, 677, D, *recipere*, 638, B, and *suseipere*, 724, A, are used, like *partes agere*, as idioms; and more formal metaphors, such as *in deorum senatum*, 411, D, *agmen morborum*, 805, E, and *quot agmina morborum infestent?* 431, A; *bonorum pelagus*, 483, B, and *superstitionum pelagus ingredior*, 446, A; *mare fabularum aperuisti*, 765, C, occur frequently.

Metonymy is also a favorite figure with Erasmus. As a rule, however, it is exceedingly conventional: *Apolline nullo*, 721, F; *Chrysippum agere*, 661, D; *irata Delia*, 633, E; *favet Delia*, 738, A; *Epicureos agere*, 660, A; *Hercule dextro*, 452, B; 736, C; *Herculem praestare*, 660, F; *meo Marte gessi*, 733, D; *Marte suo vincere*, 647, E; *Mercurio dextro*, 824, C; *Mercurio favente*, 761, E, 824, A; *Mercurio bene fortunante*, 736, C; *invita Minerva*, 859, D; *crassa Minerva*, 832, D, 873, B; *pingui Minerva*, 420, A, 448, B, 772, D; *reluctante Minerva*, 418, C; *ni prorsus repugnat Minerva*, 860, A; *Mitionem praebere*, 662, F, and *agere*, 734, B; *Nestorem praestare*, 747, C; *adhibitis Nymphis* (sc. *aqua*), 662, A; *Silenum agere*, 803, B; *Demeae sunt*, 629, A, 662, F.*

The metonymy is often embodied in an epithet: *Achillea argumenta*, 693, C; *Alcedonia* (sc. *tempora*), 834, C; *schola Catiana*, 662, C; *Chrysippeae subtilitates*, 467, B; *Democriticas fabulas*, 877, D; *Diogenica*, *Platonica*, *Pythagorica cena*, 659, E; *Epicurea vita*, 641, A; 833, C; *gladiatoria firmitas*, 832, F, and *latera*, 751, B; *Gorgonei oculi*, 784, D; *cenationes Lucullianae*, 684, F; *urbem Mercurialem*, 863, A; *Nestorea senecta*, 431, C; *Saguntina fames*, 787, E; *risum Sardonicum*, 721, B; *Scythica concio*, 712, D; *Scythicum convivium*, 765, F; *prandium Sybaritum*, *Carmelitum*, 680, B; *Thrasonica stultitia*, 742, A; *Thrasonica omnia*, 822, C; *eine Thrasoni?* 827, C; *HomERICA mendacia*, 796, B.

Alliteration and homoeoteleuton occur frequently in an accidental, unconscious way; but it is seldom that they are used intentionally. Such instances are, perhaps, *sensim spiritus et succum*, 415, A; *si pergam popularium stultitiarum et insaniarum formas enumerare*, 457, A; and, without doubt, *bella bellaria*, 825, C, and 864, D. In the verses of the *Epithalimium*, 748, D, E, F, there are several alliterative verses, one distich in particular having a line that is artificially so:

Illa caritate superet coniugum Admeti ducis,
Quae volens mortem mariti morte mutavit sua.

Erasmus sometimes trifles with his words, *subtillissimas subtilitates subtiliores reddunt*, etc., 465, C, and he not infrequently descends to a pun. *Alea* and *Malea*

* The remarkably frequent use of such figures as those contained in this and more especially in the following paragraph is doubtless due in part to a persistence of the mediaeval habit of considering great historical characters as personifications of a particular virtue or vice, as is illustrated in the development of the morality plays, or in such expressions as *fata Neronizant*, *Neronior Platonior*, *Salomonior*, in the elegies of Henricus Septimellensis.

are associated in this way several times, *e. g.*—736, C; other examples are: *Apud Hibernos igitur hibernasti?* 736, E; *quae Romanam sedem onerat—lapsa sum, honorat*, 483, C; *neque quisquam illorum Graeculos istos pluris facit quam graculos*, 491, D; *Sorbonam, ubi bene sorbetur*, 666, B; *Miser, quam penitus oculos tuos obsedit ὁ σκοτός*—*i. e., Scotus*, 747, A. There is a spice of malice about these that relieves the puerility of the device.

Renaissance Latin is usually characterized by a certain uniformity, almost a monotony of tone and color, due largely to the fact that its forms of expression and literary apparatus in general were drawn from a comparatively limited field and one already familiar to us. Even when an author tries to be original, and faithfully to represent the spirit of his time, he never can quite conceal the fact that his small-clothes have been cut out of a toga. One sometimes feels in reading works of this period, as if he were at a masquerade, where his fancy is often tickled by recognizing a familiar character from literature or history, but where he would like occasionally to lay aside the masks and come face to face with the impersonators themselves. Like the authors in Irving's dream, the writers are tricked out with the finery of a former generation, a wig from this one and a cloak from that, only in this case there is no intention of deceiving, but like children trooping down from the attic at a holiday reunion, they parade their spoils ostentatiously, and each seems to feel that he has assumed with them something of the glory and romance of a half-forgotten age. By Erasmus' time, however, this innocent plagiarism had become to a large extent unconscious. Centos had become idioms of the literary language, which he handles much as we do those conventional phrases that our modern writers repeat a score of times in every dozen pages. When Erasmus has occasion to refer to the pleasure that men take in recalling past trials and the difficulties that they have overcome, for instance, the form in which he expresses the thought is determined, probably in a sort of automatic way, by Vergil's *et haec olim fortasse meminisse iuvabit*. He does not quote these words; they are used rather with the freedom of a proverb. So he says in the *Colloquies*, *incundum est meminisse laborum actorum*, 639, B; *iucundi sunt acti labores*, 712, B; *ante actorum laborum iucunda recordatio*, 819, C; or, *actorum laborum solet esse iucunda commemoratio*, 862, E. It probably would have been very unconventional, and have smacked of literary heresy, to have gone beyond the dictum of the master in a case like this.

Closely allied with expressions of this sort are the proverbs which one would naturally expect to be common in the writings of the author of the *Adages*, especially in a work like the *Colloquies*, where the conversational form gives ample opportunity for the introduction of pithy apothegms and folk-sayings. This expectation is not disappointed, as the examples given below will sufficiently testify.

One might indulge in some interesting speculations in connection with proverbs as to why that humble and unassuming immigrant from Asia, the ass, should have secured such an important position in European literature; especially in the sayings of the common people. His literary biography remains to be written; but when it is, it will form an interesting chapter in the history of European letters. Like his Latin isonym he would need a Budaeus perhaps to do him justice. The pig seems to have been the only animal that competed with him in the favor

of the Romans; in the Middle Ages he was raised to the dignity of an epic hero; and by the time of Poggio he figured without a rival as the most prominent quadruped in facetious anecdotes. With Erasmus he is decidedly a favorite. *Asinus* is quite classical, in fact Ciceronian, for a blockhead, and while the adjective *asininus* with the precise signification of stupid—the sense with which Erasmus uses it in the *Encomium*—does not occur in the classical writings preserved to us, we can safely assume that that meaning was one familiar to the Romans. *In-versus Apuleius* occurs for *asinus* twice, 729, E; 851, E, and proverbs and allusions of the following character are found in the works to which we refer: *non credo volare asinos*, 781, D; *dolo, ut asini solent sarcinas impostas (suscipere)*, where there is allusion to Horace, Sat. I., 9; *sub exuvio leonis latet asinus*, 831, E; *ab equo ad asinos*, to make a poor move, assume an inferior position, 666, E, 736, A, 764, F; *ab asino delapsus*, of one who has wandered from his subject, 794, D; *audio velut asinus lyrem*, 747, B, which occurs often in the Greek form, sufficiently explains itself. The phrase, *ab umbra asini*, which occurs several times in the *Colloquies* and *Epistles*, is an allusion to the story told by Demosthenes of a dispute between the rider and driver of a hired ass as to which had the right to rest in its shadow, and refers, of course, to eccentric and trifling litigation.

Among true proverbs we may also class the following; *a calce ad carceres*, from the finish to the starting point, a figure taken from the circus and referring to those who have to do a thing over again, 682, B; *ad lequeum res redit*, for which we find, *ad restim res redit* (Phormio, 686), the noose is the only resource, for those in desperate circumstances, 787, E; *ansa trahit ansam*, one thing suggests another, 763, B; the opposite of which is *clavus clavo pellitur*, one idea displaces another, 847, B. *Ansa* suggests another proverbial allusion implied in, *ansa tantum arripis illum qua teneri non potest*, which means to seize the wrong horn of a dilemma, 706, F. The meaning of, *ante victoriam canere triumphum*, which we express more simply by "counting chickens before they are hatched," 646, E, and of, *artem quaevis terra alit*, of Greek origin, 758, B, is evident. *Bovem adducere ad ceroma*, 418, C, 851, B, which suggests our "bull in a china shop," is a classical proverb, also is referred to by Gregory of Tours, *praef. Confessors*; *videtur ut bos piger palaestrae ludum exerceat*. *Canis caninam non est*, 740, A, is not given in the *Chiliades*, but finds its counterpart again in one of the many proverbs in Gregory, this time put into the mouth of the Frankish monarch, *corvus oculum corvi non eruit*, H. F. 5, 18. Crows are referred to, however, in the classical proverb, *conicum oculos configere*, 491, C, to deceive the sharp sighted, something like our "to throw dust into one's eyes." The sharp sight of the lynx is alluded to as proverbial sometimes, 463, A, 465, B. *Clavam extorquere e manu Herculis*, is a classical proverb suggesting a difficult undertaking, 645, D. *Corycaeis plena sunt omnia*, 640, B, where we should say, "The very walls have ears," refers to the spies at Coryci, who informed the pirates of the movements of the trading vessels. *Cretensem agere cum Cretense*, 756, E, and, *Cretensis incidit in Cretensem*, 831, B, to play the rogue with the rogue and to meet one's match at roguery, refer to the ill repute of the Cretians for honesty, in which they were associated with the Cappadocians and Cilicians as the *τρία κάππα κάρκισα* of antiquity. *Difficile canem vetulum loris assuescere*, 662, B, hardly needs

as others see us, occurs in Catullus, Phaedrus and Perseus; *non omnibus dormio*, 844, E, refers to a racy anecdote told of Maecenas and his host Galba by Plutarch; its approximate equivalent is our "sleeping with one eye open." *Novus rex, nova lex*, 759, E, is mentioned as a *vulgo iactatum*, *non tam vanum quam parum Latini proverbium*. *Nuces relinquere*, 653, F, to leave childish things, is very familiar, and Horace's *equitare in arundine longa*, 403, is used of unbending to childish sports. *Non ignis absque fumo*, 859, A, needs no special remark; *oleum addere camino*, 856, D, to add fuel to the flame, has an almost antithetical equivalent: *frigidam suffundere*, 633, D, from the water thrown on the smithy fire to increase the heat. *Odi puerum praecoci sapientia*, 414, A, is a quotation from Horace given as a proverb in the *Adages*. *Perit oleum et opera*, 639, D, from the *Poenulus* of Plautus, 1, 2, 122, and *sors et usura perit*, taken from the wrestling school and commercial life respectively, have the same meaning. *Plurimum refert quid infundas rudi testulae*, 696, F, is an allusion to a quotation from Horace's epistles (1, 2, 69), that is given in full in another place, 768, E, and is also used as a proverb by Muretus. *Pro thesauro carbones*, 698, B, 763, A, is a proverb found in Phaedrus, 5, 6. *Qui pessime canit primus incipiet*, is also mentioned as a *vulgo iactatum proverbium*, 721, E. Erasmus is indebted to the *Phormio* of Terence again for *quot homines tot sententiae*, 842, E, *et passim*. *Plus vident oculi quam oculus*, 824, B, is a little like our "Two heads are better than one." *Rem acu tangere*, 642, C, 661, D, *et passim* from Plautus, *Rudens*, 1306, is possibly a reference to the surgeon's needle (Cf. Apuleius, *Met.* 8), and in Erasmus is about equivalent to our "Hit the nail on the head." *Revulsit pilos caudae equinae*, 743, E, is an allusion to the well-known legend of Sertorius, which is referred to indirectly by Horace, *Ep.* 2, 1, 45. *Sat cito si sat bene*, 654, D, needs no comment. *Satius est cessare quam nihil agere*, 724, E, and *praestat otiosum esse quam nihil agere*, 636, E, from the first epistle of Pliny, is intended to express the fact that it is better to do nothing than to waste one's time over trifles. A Greek proverb, which Erasmus cites, however, from Aulus Gellius, is, *Saepe etiam est olitor valde opportuna locutus*, 809, F. Another proverb of Greek origin, quoted once in that language, 407, D, is, *Simia semper simia etiam purpura vestita*, 418, D. *Sero sapiunt Phryges*, 885, E, the force of which is clear enough, is a classical proverb, naturally, but of uncertain derivation. It may refer to the tardy desire of the Trojans to restore Helen to the Greeks, as Festus explains it, or it may be an allusion to the tragedy mentioned by Cicero, *Ad Fam.*, 7, 16; *In Equo Triano scis esse in extremo; sero sapiunt*; or it is not impossible that the two theories as to its origin can be reconciled to each other. *Servus prae servo est*, 853, C, there is no dead level, even among slaves, is of Homeric origin, and *Spartam quae contingit orno*, 738, B, is from Euripides. *Tyria maria concitare*, 801, F, to occasion a great disturbance of any sort, seems to refer to the time when Carthage forbade the navigation of the Tyrian sea to other nations. *In ipso portu implegi*, 724, D, to suffer shipwreck at the outset of an undertaking, is from St. Jerome, a parallel to the *in limine offendere* of Vergil. *Vulpus anus non capitur laqueo*, 693, F, 813, A, is ancient testimony to Reynard's cunning, which is supported by the allusion contained in *vulpina prudentia*, 497, B. *Durum est telum necessitas*, 712, E, 755, A, 807, A, is perhaps Erasman, as is also doubtless the sententious expression of a common sentiment in, *ubicumque pura mens est, ibi Deus est*, 824.

Very similar to true proverbs are various colloquial expressions of a proverbial character,—proverbs worn down to idioms, we might call them. Some of these are hardly to be distinguished from those just mentioned; others have lost their figurative force almost entirely and have become mere turns of speech. As a rule but a single citation is given, though the expressions often occur *passim* throughout both the *Colloquies* and the *Encomium*. *Ab ipso statim lacte*, 696, F; *a teneris unguiculis*, 695, C; *abeant or abigere in malam rem or crucem*, 750, E; *aberrare or abesse a scopo*, 639, C; *attigere scopum*, 661, D; *actum agere*, 818, C; *agere fabulam*, 749, D; *ad unguem*, 721, E; *albis quadrigis*, i. e., quickly, suggests *quadrigae meae decucurrerunt*, Petronius (64), 452, A; *albo corvo rarior*, 705, C; *adamanto durior*, 693, D; *aere Dodonaeo loquacius*, 461, C; *arrodero unguem*, 648, D; *aures arrigere*, 664, A; *bonis avibus, bona verba, boni consulite, passim*; *cadit alea*, 638, C; *camelum saltantem*, 675, B; *cicadem ala correptam*, 811, C; *claudere latus*, 658, C; *Coroebo stultior*, 821, B; *corvos hiantes*, 763, D; *larum hiantem*, 758, C, and *lupus hians*, 641, A; *curare cutem or cuticulam*, 631, B; *dama fugacior*, 641, E; *de plastro loqui*, 733, D; *ficulum praesidium*, 642, E; *ficum ficum, scapham scapham dicere*, 712, A; *folia Sybillae*, 656, B; *gemma bibere*, 662, A; *lapidi dicere*, 719, A, *pisci dicere*, 797, C, and *surdo canere*, 775, B; *Luculli divitiae*, 661, C; *lupus in fabula*, 636, F, and *quasi conspecto lupo*, 423, A, refers to the superstition that a man lost his voice if seen by a wolf before he saw it. *Indulgere genio*, 659, F; *ne musca quidem*, 646, D; *ne mica quidem*, 754, B (the former is the more common in Erasmus); *nihil habere dentis*, 820, A; *nihil esse nasi*, 755, B, and *navis obesae*, 403; *omnium horarum homo*, 654, A; *Orbilio plagiosior*, 654, B; *os laedere*, 734, B; *os oblinere*, 774, E; *ovum ab ovo*, 647, B; *omnis lapis movendus*, 837, D; *par pari referre*, 646, D; *perfricare faciem*, 480, F; *perfricare frontem*, 645, E, *exporrigere frontem*, 405, C; *Persarum gaza*, 846, B; *pleniis tibiis*, 812, C; *plusquam animam debere*, 695, A; *prora et puppis*, 640, B; *rore vivere*, 660, B; *Siculae gerrae*, 639, C; *tria verba*, 696, F; *spe lactare*, 659, D.

Erasmus was the last person to write in Latin works that were both popular and influential. Neither he nor any of his predecessors or contemporaries ever quite attained the classical grace and correctness of Muretus' scholarly discourses. The ponderous learning of Grotius and the wisdom of Bacon was still to find in Latin its medium of expression. Barclay was to use it for the novel, and innumerable pedagogues were yet to imitate Plautus and Terence in school festival plays. This Latin that followed was formally correct, the Latin of the age of lexicons and systematic grammars and stylistic compendia. But with Luther's Bible and the vernacular literature that arose with it the life had gone out of Latin. The constituency of the people was superseding that of the schools, and its literature was assuming first rank. Hereafter he who wrote with the artistic impulse and the fervor of inspiration was to commit his thoughts to the tongue of his country. The ideal of Latin had changed. It was no longer the language of the future. It had become the tongue of the past.*

Erasmus' attack on the Ciceronians was really an offensive campaign against

* *Rien me semble mort comme le cicéronianisme de la Renaissance du seizième siècle Rien n'est vivant en revanche comme le balbutiement de l'humanisme naissant*, Cochin, o. c., 35 and 36.

this very tendency to make Latin exclusively a language of the schools. He who wrote a book "standing on one foot," as he says, had little patience for the artificial niceties of the purists. He appreciated the fact that Latin must maintain vernacular characteristics, must grow and adapt itself to the needs of the time, if it was to retain its supremacy as the literary language. We already have sufficient evidence of the fact that he adopted this principle in practice, and, unconsciously perhaps, formed his idioms after the fashion of the popular speech of his own time and of antiquity. There is something analogous in the last transformation of living Latin to what we see in case of the late Silurian fossils, where shells become distorted in a thousand ways in the effort of the occupant to adapt himself to changing conditions before the order becomes extinct. After Erasmus' time Latin loses its quality of originality. It becomes a copy; and the most we can expect of those who employ it for literary purposes is that now and then a writer may do for a Roman author what Hilda, in *Marble Faun*, did for the old masters of painting, catch something of the spirit as well as the form of the works he imitates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

[In cases where more than one work of an author has been consulted the letters used in citations are placed in brackets after the title.]

I. PLEBEIAN AND ECCLESIASTICAL LATIN.

- | | | |
|--|-----------|--------|
| Anthimi, de Observatione Ciborum Epistula, ed. Rose, | Lips. | 1877. |
| Arciv für Lateinische Lexicographie [A. L. L.], | Lips. | 1884.* |
| I. Gröber, Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter, pp. 204 et seq. | | |
| II. Sittl, Zur Beurtheilung des sogenannten Mittellateins, pp. | | |
| Benedicti, Regula Monachorum, ed Wöllflein, | Lips. | 1895. |
| Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, | Paris, | 1890. |
| Cooper, Word Formation of the Sermo Plebeius, | Boston, | 1890. |
| Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum [C. I. L.], | Hannover. | |
| Fauriel, Dante et Les Origines de la Langue et de la Littérature Italiennes, | Paris, | 1854. |
| Hagen, Sprachliche Erörterung zur Vulgata, | Freiburg, | 1853. |
| Hauschild, Wortbildung bei Tertullian, | Lips. | 1876. |
| Kaulen, Geschichte der Vulgata [G. V.], | Mainz, | 1868. |
| Kaulen, Handbuch der Vulgata [H. V.], | Mainz, | 1870. |
| Monceaux, Le Latin Vulgaire, Revue des Deux Mondes, T. 116, | Paris, | 1891. |
| Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum Rerum Merovingicarum, T. I. | | |
| [M. G. H. s. r. m. l.], | | |
| Gregory of Tours, Opera Omnia, | Berlin, | |
| Rönsch, Itala und Vulgata, | Marburg, | 1875. |
| Schuchardt, Der Vocalismus des Vulgärlateins, | Lips. | 1866. |
| Vulgate and Erasmus' Translation in Parallel Columns, | Bâle, | 1538. |

II. MIDDLE AGE LATIN.

- | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Alberti Stadensis, Troilus, ed. Merzdorf, | Lips. | 1875. |
| Bacon, Opus Magnum, ed. Jebb, | Lon. | 1733. |
| Baedae, Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, ed. Holder, Freiburg und | | |
| | Tübingen, | 1882. |
| Carmina Burana, ed. Schmeller, | Breslau, | 1883. |
| Comparetti, Vergilio nel Medio Evo, Livorno, 1872 (Trans. Benecke), | | |
| | London, | 1895. |
| du Méril, Poésies Populaires Latines antérieures au XII ^e me Siecle [P. P. D. S.], | | |
| | Paris, | 1843. |
| du Méril, Poésies Populaires Latines du Moyen Âge [P. P. M. A.], | | |
| | Paris, | 1847. |
| du Méril, Poésies Inédites du Moyen Age [P. I. M. A.], | Paris, | 1854. |

- Dümmler, Anselm der Peripatetiker, Halle, 1872.
 Ebert, Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters, 3 Bde. Lips. 1889.
 Feugueray, Doctrines Politiques de St. Thomas d'Aquin, Paris, 1857.
 Francke, Lateinische Schulpoesie, Monaco, 1879.
 Gadsfredus Monumentensis, Historia Britonum, ed. Giles, London, 1844.
 Gebhart, Les Origines de la Renaissance en Italie, Paris, 1879.
 Giesebrecht, de Litterarum studiis apud Italos Primis Medii Aevi Saeculis, Berlin, 1845.
 Gildas, de Excidio Britanniae, ed. Stevenson, London, 1838.
 Grimm und Schmeller, Lateinische Gedichte des X und XI Jahrhunderts, Göttingen, 1838.
 Habatsch, Die Lateinischen Vagantenlieder des Mittelalters, Görlitz, 1870.
 John of Salisbury, Policraticos, Lyons, 1513.
 Kaulich, Geschichte der Scholastischen Philosophie, Prague, 1863.
 Körting, Die Anfänge der Renaissance litteratur in Italien [A. L. I.], Lips. 1884.
 Mapes, Latin Poems, ed. Wright [L. P.], London, 1841.
 Mapes, Nuga Curialium, ed. Wright [N. C.], London, 1850.
 Möller, Johannes Scotus Erigena, Mainz, 1844.
 Monumenta Historica Britannica, Vol. I. [M. H. B.], London, 1848.
 Monumenta Germaniae Historica, ed. Pertz [M. G. H.], Hannover.
 Scriptores [M. G. H. s.].
 Scriptores Antiquissimi [M. G. H. s. a.].
 Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum [M. G. H. s. r. m.].
 Poetae Medii Aevi [M. G. H. p. m. a.].
 Muratori, Scriptores [M. S.],
 Muratori, Antiquitates Italicae [M. A. I.], Arretii, 1775.
 Notices des Manuscrits de la Bibliotheque Nationale [N. d. M.], Paris, 1880.
 Patrologia Latina, Tom. I.—CXXXIV. [P. L.], Paris, 18—.
 Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France [Rec.], Paris, 1862.
 Renan, Averroës et l'Averroïsme, Paris, 1866.
 Ronca, Cultura Medioevale e Poesia Latina d'Italia nei XI e XII Secoli, Roma, 1892.
 Schütz, Thomas—Lexicon, Paderborn, 1895.
 Suger, Oeuvres Completes (pub. de la société de l'hist. de France), Paris, 1867.
 Theofridus, Vita Willibrordi, ed. Rossberg, Lips. 1883.
 Tiraboschi, Storia della Letteratura Italiana, Milano, 1823.
 Thurot, Notices et extraits de divers manuscrits latins pour servir à l'histoire des doctrines grammaticales au moyen âge, Paris, 1868.
 Vitae Sanctorum, Metricae, ed. Harster, Lips. 1887.
 West, Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools, New York, 1892.

III. DANTE AND PETRARCH.

- Baumker, Quibus antiquis auctoribus Petrarca in conscribendis rerum memorandarum libris usus sit, Münster, 1882.

- Baldelli Boni, *Del Petrarca e delle sue Opere*, Firenze, 1797.
 Celsus, *Commentarii de Vita Caesaris*, ed. Achaintre et Lemaire, Paris, 1820.
 Dante, *La Divina Commedia*, Paris, 1875.
 Dante, *Opere Latine*, ed. Giuliani, Firenze, 1882.
 Hettner, *Petrarca und Boccaccio*, *Deutsche Rundschau*, II, 228.
 Körting, *Geschichte der Litteratur Italiens*, Lips. 1878.
 Macri-Leone, *La Bucolica Latina nella Litteratura Italiana del Secolo XIV*, Torino, 1889.
 Mézières, *Pétrarque, Étude d'après de Nouveaux Documents*, Paris, 1868.
 Moore, *Dante and his Early Biographers*, London, 1890.
 Muretus, *Scripta Selecta*, ed. Frey, Lips. 1887.
 Nelli, *Lettres a Pétrarque*, ed. Cochin, Paris, 1892.
 Nollac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme en Italie*, Paris.
 Petrarca, *Opera Latina*, Venetiis, 1501.
 Petrarca, *De Contemptu Mundi; de Remediis utriusque Fortunae*, Roterodami, 1649.
 Petrarca, *De Viris Illustribus Vitae*, Bologna, 1874.
 Petrarca, *Epistulae de Rebus Familiaribus*, ed. Fracassati, Firenze, 1859.
 Petrarca, *Poemata Minora*, Milano, 1829.
 Petrarca, *Rime*, Firenze, 1886.
 Poggio, *Epistulae*, ed. Tonellis, Firenze, 1832.
 Philelphus, *Vita Dantis Aligerii*, Florentia, 1828.
 Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums*, Berlin, 1893.
 Zingerle, *Petrarcha's Verhältniss zu den römischen Dichtern*, Innsbruck, 1871.
 Zumbini, *Studi sul Petrarca*, Firenze, 1895.

IV. ERASMUS.

- Amiel, *Un Libre-penseur du XVI^{me} Siècle*, Paris, 1889.
 Butler, *Life of Erasmus, with a general survey of literature from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries*, London, 1825.
 Drummund, *Life and Character of Erasmus*, London, 1873.
 Durand du Lauer, *Érasme, précurseur et initiateur de l'esprit moderne*, Paris, 1872.
 Erasmus, *Opera Omnia*, Lugduni, 1703.
 Erasmus, *Colloquia et Encomium Moriae*, ed. Rabus, Norimburgae, 1774.
 Feugère, *Érasme*, Paris, 1874.
 Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus*, New York, 1894.
 Hess, *Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Zurich, 1790.
 Lévesque de Burigny, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages d'Érasme*, Paris, 1757.
 Muller, *Leben des Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Hamburg, 1828.
 Nisard, *Érasme*, Paris, 1877.
 Richter, *Erasmus-Studien*, Dresden, 1891.
 Schneider, *de Proverbiis Plautinis Terentianisque*, Berlin, 1878.
 Schönfeld, *Die Beziehung, der Satire Rabelais' zu Erasmus' Encomium Moriae und Colloquia*, *Mod. Lang. Ass'n. of Am. Pub.*, Vol. 8, Baltimore, 1893.
 Stichart, *Erasmus von Rotterdam, seine Stellung zu der Kirche und zu den Kirchlichen Bewegungen seiner Zeit*, Lips. 1870.

ADDENDA.

- | | | |
|--|---------|-------|
| Gesta Romanorum, ed. Oesterley, | Berlin, | 1872. |
| Epistulae Obscurorum Virorum, Unrichi Huttoni opera, Supplementum, Vol. I, | | |
| ed. Böcking, | Lips. | 1868. |
| Federigo secundo, | Torino, | |
| Draeger, Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache, | Lips. | 1878. |

VITA.

Rei publicae Neo Eboracensis oppidulo quod Anglice Portageville vocatur anno Domini MDCCCLXVIII natus, primis rudimentis studiorum et in ludis publicis et apud magistros privatos exactis, anno aetatis decimo octavo Universitatem Minnesotensem intravi unde post quattuor annis gradum baccalaureum tuli. Deinde ludis publicis Minnesotae magistri munere functus sum. Tertio post acceptum baccalaureatum anno socius honoris causa Universitatis Chicagoniensis factus, apud universitatem Gottinganensium itemque Bernensium Helvetiorum studens iuris versatus, Italia, Gallia, Anglia peregrinatus, anno iam desinente ad patriam reversus sum. Iterum ludipraeceptor vel ludorum administrator apud Minnesotenses fui usque ad annum Domini MDCCCXCVII, quo tempore inter socios insignis Universitatis Columbiae acceptus ad disciplinas humaniores quarum semper studiosus eram quaeque ad doctoratus honorem spectabant me contuli. Gradu tamen nondum accepto ad Portum Divitem nuper victam vocatus, imperatoribus Henry et Davis, praeses Concilii Scholastici Superioris ludis publicis insulae praefui. Unde regressus tandem doctoris honorem quem ad adispicendum haec dissertatio scripta est consecutus sum.

Inter professores quibus praecipue mihi agenda sunt gratiae habendi sunt Judson Chicagoniensis, von Ihering Gottinganensis, quem e doctissimis iuris consultorum mors magno mei qui inter discipulos eius eram dolore eripuit imprimis tamen Peck et Egbert Columbiae, quorum unus dux et rector studiorum omnium meorum fuit, alter arcana antiquitatis per monumenta mihi aperuit, necnon et Munroe Smith qui me ius civile docuit.

